DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 869 CS 500 236

AUTHOR Goldhaber, Gerald M.
TITLE Communication and Student Unrest: A Report to the President of the University of New Mexico; Part II: University-Public Channels.
PUB DATE Sep 72
NOTE 71p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Changing Attitudes; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Community Attitudes; *Information Dissemination; Mass Media; Publicize; *Public Opinion; *School Community Relationship; Student College Relationship

ABSTRACT

This second part of a three-part study (Communication and Student Unrest) expands upon concerns generated by the original study, primarily the need for detailed examination of the channels of communication emanating from within and without the University. This report focuses on evaluation and analysis of university-public channels, specifically the University of New Mexico's attempts to bridge the "communication gap" between itself and the surrounding community. (A prior finding had been that campus unrest tended to precipitate negative attitudes toward the university.) The first two sections describe and evaluate the existing communication channels between the university and its public. The final section provides a discussion of specific recommendations for improving university-public communication, based on the study's findings. General suggestions include better use of the mass media to enhance the university's image and enlarged use of open conferences between university personnel and the general public to increase personally-oriented communication. (See related document CS 500 235.) (LG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 075869

COMMUNICATION AND STUDENT UNREST:

A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

by

GERALD M. GOLDHABER, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Speech Communication
University of New Mexico

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gerald M. Goldhaber
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

September, 1972

PART II: UNIVERSITY-PUBLIC CHANNELS

CS500236

This is a private printing of 300 copies, limited to private circulation. For confidential use only. Not for circulation, distribution or publication. All rights in this work are the property of the author, Gerald M. Goldhaber, Department of Speech Communication, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87106.

INTRODUCTION

Over one year ago, the results of Part I of this study were released. Most of the comments on the results of the report were extremely useful in planning this and any future segments. One comment, in particular, suggested that more detail be provided in the evaluation of some of the channels of communication. Adopting this suggestion forced two changes to be made in the research plans: first, later portions of the report would have to be delayed in order to collect the necessary information over a long period of time (preferably one year); and second, that selected channels of communication be scrutinized more closely than others. Both of these changes were adopted and thus, Part II of this report will concentrate on evaluating only a few highly relevant channels of communication. Analysis of channels between faculty and administrators will be included in the third part of this study in order to more closely examine selected university-public channels. The reasons for this emphasis are: many of the faculty-administration channels are similar to those used by students and faculty (committee meetings, advisory councils, faculty meetings, open doors, secretaries, etc.) and students and administrators, the topic of Part I of this report; secondly, and more importantly, university-public channels are extremely vital to the interests of all members of the greater university community, especially those which influence the vital economic pursuits of a public-supported institution.

The format of the report will be similar to that used in Part I: description of existing channels, evaluation of selected channels, and recommendations for improving communication. Part III which will also examine student, faculty and administration channels individually, will be released on or about August, 1973.

Copies of this or any part of the report may be obtained by writing directly to the author. Once again I would like to thank the students, faculty, administrators and members of the New Mexico public who cooperated in the interviews and surveys which contributed to the results of this study.

Table of Contents

		Page
	Introduction	1
	University-Public Channels	3
I.	Description of Existing Channels	6
	A. Speakers Bureau	6
	B. Public Information Office	6
	C. Written Media	7
	D. Student, Faculty, Administration Lobby	7
	E. Legislative University Study Committee	8
	F. Travel by University Leaders	9
	G. D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference	9
	H. Meetings of Governor King and UNM Faculty	10
	I. Institute for Social Research and Development	12
	J. Miscellaneous Channels of Communication	18
	K. UNM Public Opinion Poll	19
II.	Evaluation of Selected University-Public Channels of Communication	20
	A. D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference	20
	Overall Conclusion for Conference	25
	B. Meetings of Governor King and UNM Faculty	26
	Overall Conclusion for the Governor's Meetings	37
	C. Institute for Social Research and Development	38
	1. ISRAD-Community Communication	38
	Problems	39
	Recommendations	40
	2. ISRAD-Faculty Communication	42
	Problems	43
	Recommendations	44
	3. ISRAD-Internal Communication	46
	Problems	46
	Recommendations	47
	Overall Conclusion for ISRAD	48
	D. UNM Public Opinion Poll	49
	Methodology	49
	Results	54
	1. Demographic Data	54
	2. Informational Questions	57
	3. Attitudinal Questions	60
	Summary of Findings of Entire Survey	64
III.	Recommendations for Improving University-Public Communication	66
	Bibliography	70

University-Public Channels

During most of the academic year 1971-2 the nation's campuses were quiet. Many spokesmen for higher education claimed that campus unrest was a thing of the past. Indeed, with the advent of the 18 year old vote which gave 25 million youths "political power," with the increased knowledge and ability to exploit the $17 billion consumer market (existing among 18-25 year old youths) which resulted in "economic power," and with the winding down of the Vietnam War, a key issue in previous riots, much of the impetus for campus unrest was reduced. The educator-prophets who had predicted doom for the university were apparently wrong. One spokesman for higher education was more cautious. In November of 1971, M. Brewster Smith, Vice-Chancelor of the University of California-Santa Cruz (and former member of the Linowitz Committee on Campus Tensions), predicted that the campuses were potentially just as volatile as they were the previous two years. He warned that it was too early in the year for unrest and that given the right issue, the ingredients were still present on most campuses for major disturbances. In April, 1972 Brewster Smith proved correct.

The recent escalation of the Vietnam War resulted in the highest level of campus protest since the 1970 Cambodian invasion. Even though the intensity of the demonstrations was not as high in 1972 as in 1970, the Chronicle of Higher Education reported, "students on 80 campuses boycotted classes during a one-day national student strike April 21. On at least 90 other campuses there were war protests, according to the National Student Association, which called for the strike."

The level of campus unrest seems to be directly correlated to two events: the Vietnam War (which usually precedes the unrest) and negative public attitudes toward universities (which usually follows the unrest). It is this latter factor--public attitudes toward the university which we are primarily concerned with at this time. Linowitz (1970) pointed out the relation between unrest and public condemnation of universities, "widespread disruption on the nation's campuses had angered the American public. As dissatisfaction grew, so did the specter of punitive measures: reduced financial support, restrictive legislation and harsh laws for handling even peaceful demonstrators, and political intervention in the affairs of educational institutions."

It is easy to see how important public attitudes are to the future survival of American universities. It is also easy to see how, with massive press and television coverage,

public attitudes can be formed after watching five minutes of demonstrations--without leaving the living room. Bittner et.al. (1971) have reported that "American colleges and universities have received considerable exposure in the mass media during the past few years. Much of this exposure has been limited to broadcast and newspaper coverage of student demonstrations and campus unrest--coverage which a few angry administrators have labeled distorted, biased, and non-representative." One college president expressed his feelings of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the press arbitrarily report sensational stories about riots, but delete stories about positive university accomplishments, "it is understandable that the press feels compelled to cover controversial stories on the campus, many of them involving burning issues of the day in our society. However, it is difficult to understand and abide the press' refusal to give adequate and constructive coverage of the positive achievements of higher educational programs of teaching, research, and public service." (in Bittner, 1971)

The Scranton Report (1970) warns of greater doom if the schism between students and the community is not breached, "Less and less do students and the larger community seek to understand or respect the viewpoint and motivations of the other. If this trend continues, if this crisis of understanding endures, the very survival of the nation will be threatened." Recent research by Lewis (1971) illustrates the public's reactions to the use of obscenity during student demonstrations, "The sample of the Denver Metropolitan Area reacted extremely negatively toward the use of obscenity in college demonstrations. This negative reaction was even stronger than the reaction to obscenity generally. These results imply that negative feelings towards college students using obscenity in demonstrations are among the strongest held by the general population, and agree with the Harris poll finding that college demonstrators are more generally detested than prostitutes, atheists and homosexuals."

Recognizing that the public's attitude toward the university has not been positive recently, many universities are seeking ways to close the "communication gap" between them and the community. For Your Information (1970) reports several university attempts to improve communication between themselves and their public: "Kansas State University is planning a Parents Seminar which will involve eight one to two-hour sessions in six Kansas cities. . .The programs will serve to bring parents together with students, faculty, administrators and other university persons to discuss issues pertinent to university life and education. . .The University of Arkansas has set up meetings across the state to bring increased knowledge about the state university to its constituents. . .The University of South Caroline has prepared a printed booklet with answers to frequently-asked questions.

This university has also set up a group called University Associates which meets with the university administration on a periodic basis. The group's primary task is to soothe the rumor mill. The membership of approximately 400 includes both alumni and non-alumni supporters of the university. . . In another communication effort, Chancellor E. Laurence Chalmers of the University of Kansas traveled approximately 5,000 miles throughout Kansas this summer, speaking to alumni, parents, and prospective students. . ."

It is apparent that as long as student unrest is present on campuses that the public's attitude will be more negative toward universities than positive. It is also apparent that universities must combat this negative effect by utilizing innovative communication media, devices and techniques. This section of the report will describe and evaluate the University of New Mexico's attempts to combat the "communication gap" between itself and its community.

I. Description of Existing Channels between UNM and its Public

A. Speakers Bureau

The speakers bureau at UNM was created on July 1, 1970 by the Public Information Office. Its purpose is to provide UNM staff and faculty speakers for any service, civic, or educational group in New Mexico (at no cost to the requesting organization). The bureau is managed by Jean Bosl and has prepared a brochure of the speakers, their photographs, and the topics they have to offer. The brochure has been sent to clubs and organizations throughout the state. Topics range from university issues to such areas as drugs, family life, hunting, communication problems, recreation, economic development, etc.

Since its inception almost two years ago, over two hundred UNM faculty and staff have volunteered their services; over 250 requests have been filled (mostly in the Albuquerque area). Fewer than 50 speakers have been sent outside the city limits to date. Most frequent users of this service have been the: Rotary Club, Caravan Club, Optimist Club and Civitan Club.

Feedback has been overwhelmingly positive and has been assessed by the manager of the bureau by calling both organization and speaker immediately after the speech. She also personally listens to several speeches herself. The only limitation possibly has been that where such a channel could be most valuable (outside of Albuquerque) has been where it has been least used. This is probably because of two factors: faculty and staff members are reluctant to travel great distances (for free); and organizations outside of Albuquerque do not have that much contact (informally or formally) with the university and thus may not think of the speakers bureau when they desire a speaker. This last reason is unfortunate because it is primarily to combat this reaction that the speakers bureau was formed.

B. Public Information Office (PIO)

The PIO has the responsibility for all information releases from the university. Under the direction of Jess Price, a former journalist, they handle all sports information, news releases and photos for all media, local, state, regional and national (including television and radio).

The PIO publishes the Campus News (faculty-staff newspaper) which will be discussed in the next section of this report. It also has a 15 minute weekly television show (on KNME-TV)--UNM Reports--and 2 five minute news and

sports tapes each morning on statewide radio stations. Efforts are made by the PIO to concentrate on news that involves both community and campus problems which relate to each other. Despite being limited to the media's determination of how much time or space should be allowed for a given story, between 80-90% of the material prepared by the PIO and sent to the media is used. The PIO also operates the Speakers Bureau, described above.

C. Written Media

As in any organization, there are ample written media available for dissemination to the community. Among these media are: the President's letter, a one-page letter published several times a year and sent to a list of UNM "friends and supporters;" the UNM Bulletin, published twelve times a year and sent to selected readers (the January issue carries the President's Annual Report); various alumni publications (sent to alumni of UNM); graduate and undergraduate catalogues (sent out upon request); "Your University," an information publication sent to people inquiring about the university.

Most of these written media are for public relations purposes and are sent on request to most citizens. Their effectiveness is questionable, as is the effectiveness of any mechanical medium of communication. They are probably necessary but should not be emphasized as a means of improving external communication.

D. Student, Faculty, Administration Lobby

Actually, while the purposes of the three are generally similar--to promote the good of the university with the State Legislature--the three lobbies usually act independently, promoting their own personal self-interests. The student lobby is composed of both undergraduate and graduate students who actively engage in lobbying for student programs (better library, married-student housing, etc.) both during the actual legislative session and when the legislature is not in session. The latter activity is an ongoing year-round venture, requiring patience and resources. One particularly successful lobby effort by the students was to sponsor a cocktail party for the legislatures (during the last two sessions). The student lobby is currently headed by Albert Chavez, and is financed by both undergraduate and graduate funds.

The faculty lobby is composed of certain faculty members designated by the Faculty Policy Committee, and their purpose is to represent faculty interests to the legislature. The chief lobbyist for the administration

has been the Vice-President for Administration and Development (although he is usually assisted by the President's former assistant, Ted Martinez). Faculty salaries was a prime issue lobbied for during the last session by the faculty lobby; and the university budget, in general, usually occupies much of the administration lobby's time. While it is impossible to demonstrate causation (except by interviewing all legislators), one possible index to evaluate the success of the lobby effort is to witness the nature of the legislation passed by the state legislature which is either favorable or unfavorable to the university. Except for low faculty salaries, UNM has escaped many of the legislative mandates issued by other state legislatures: dictating teaching loads, implementing and dictating curricula, limiting faculty travel, eliminating faculty raises, reducing university budgets (below their current levels), etc.

E. Legislative University Study Committee (LUSC)

In 1969 the LUSC was formed to investigate the University of New Mexico as a result of an incident involving a "dirty" poem in an English class (by a teaching assistant). Since the "Love Lust Poem" incident, the LUSC has remained as an Ad Hoc Legislative Committee, financed by a $50,000 appropriation. During the 1971-2 academic year, the LUSC began a tour of public university campuses, at the invitation of student leaders. The main purpose of the campus tour was to establish a better line of communication between university students in New Mexico and the State Legislature. The committee has heard a variety of student complaints about curriculum, parking, and inadequate library facilities. On all campuses it was well received, except for some minor opposition at UNM (the Lobo editorialized against the committee).

The format for the November 5, 1971 visit of the LUSC on the UNM campus was as follows: a two hour meeting with student leaders, a tour of campus, lunch, an open forum in the student union building (for 2½ hours in the afternoon), and a cocktail party in the late afternoon. (The following day, some members of the committee attended a football game.) During the open forum, approximately 45 people attended (mostly students), asking approximately twenty questions (on such topics as: library, day care center, purpose of the LUSC, narcotics, bachelor of business degree, etc.). Only nine members of the committee showed up for the meeting which lasted just over one hour (even though it was scheduled for 2½ hours). The meeting was covered by the local media (TV, newspaper and radio), and

after the formal question-answer session ended, some members of the committee remained for informal discussions with the audience. During this portion of the meeting, the committee members moved from the ballroom stage (where they had been seated behind a long table covered by a white sheet) to the floor of the ballroom.

It is the opinion of this researcher that better use could be made of the $50,000 (such as buying books for the library, as was pointed out in an Albuquerque Journal editorial). In order to promote better communication between the university and the legislature, other means exist (which do not lend themselves to potential political exploitation of the university by certain legislators): retreats, rap sessions, legislative study days, etc. (See recommendation section for more details on this point.)

F. Travel by University Leaders

Although this channel overlaps the purpose of the Speakers Bureau, it is treated separately because of the personnel involved, and their ability to greatly influence public opinion toward the university. We primarily refer here to President Heady and both student body presidents (undergraduate and graduate). Every trip to a service club or organization, especially outside Albuquerque, which one of them makes, is an opportunity to aid public attitudes toward the university.

G. D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference

In January, 1968 the student body of UNM invited Stokely Carmichael to speak on campus. The state legislature, which was in session at the time, reacted immediately and extremely negatively. The media (TV, radio, press) carried stories throughout the state about this act, and the legislature passed "a memorial censuring the University for permitting the invitation to stand." (from "D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conference: Retreat into Reality," by Jess Price) Even though Carmichael never spoke on campus (he cancelled), the University had already suffered from extreme adverse publicity.

Shortly after this episode, it became evident to a small group of students, faculty and administration that something must be done to change the image of UNM and better inform influential opinion leaders about the role and purpose of a university. Since the University had previously sponsored weekend retreats at its D. H. Lawrence

Ranch property (160 acres in the Sangre de Cristo Range north of Taos, New Mexico--given to UNM by Frieda Lawrence, widow of D. H. Lawrence), it was decided to use this setting for an informal gathering of university and community leaders. A planning committee arranged for administration approval for such a conference and financing by both student government and the University's Development Office, thus involving no tax appropriations. Initial cost estimates were $1,200, but the final cost of the first conference was $1,100 (mostly for meals). Transportation to the ranch was left up to the individual participants; housing at the conference was provided in dormitory and cabin facilities on the property.

The conference was scheduled for the weekend of April 26-28, 1968, and was attended by approximately 80 university faculty, staff and students, plus community leaders from around the state (and their wives). The agenda was informal and included small group discussions and larger sessions to report findings of the small groups to the entire conference. Topics discussed included such issues as academic freedom, campus speakers, university-public communication, etc. Reaction to the conference by both the participants and the press was overwhelmingly favorable. Because of this positive response, a second D. H. Lawrence conference was scheduled for the next fall (October 11-13, 1968). Since then two additional conferences have been held, most recently last fall (October 29-31, 1971). This researcher was present at the last conference, and it will be evaluated later in this report.

H. Meetings of Governor King and UNM Faculty

On October 30, 1970, this researcher met with Governor Cargo to discuss his involvement in the 1970 student unrest on the campus of UNM. During this meeting the Governor stated that one of the most pressing needs he felt during the unrest was for communication with the faculty, "adequate channels exist with the students (through the Governor's Student Advisory Committee) and administration. I would be in favor of meeting with a small group of faculty members--about twenty--twice a month, in the evening." Governor Cargo added that the meetings would be beneficial if they did nothing more than improve relations between the faculty and the governor. Mr. Cargo's initial enthusiasm for such communication did not, however, result in any meetings because he soon left office. Meanwhile, this researcher contacted (via questionnaire) 100 faculty members at UNM to assess their interest in such meetings. All responding faculty members (44) agreed that such a channel would be useful, but most suggested that it would be best to await the new governor's term.

When Bruce King was elected in November, this researcher contacted him, and discussed the possibility of beginning the meetings. His response was enthusiastic, and he agreed to such a proposal provided that: a representative sample of all opinion on the faculty was present at each meeting; and that the meetings operate for one year (on a trial basis) until some evaluative data could be provided to assess their success. The President of UNM was then notified, and this researcher began to coordinate these meetings.

After consulting with certain "vocal" faculty members, the following format was outlined and presented to the Governor:

1. Meetings would last approximately 1½ hours.
2. Meetings would alternate between Santa Fe (in the Governor's office) and Albuquerque (in the New Mexico Union).
3. Meetings would be attended by the Governor (and his aides) and approximately twenty faculty members.
4. Meeting format would be unstructured, informal and relaxed; any topic was open for discussion.
5. Selection of faculty would be randomized in order to assure representativeness (stratification by rank and department or college was employed). The only deviation from this procedure was the first meeting, where an attempt was made to include "vocal" faculty members. It was felt that in this manner: a lively discussion would likely follow; and if the meetings were successful, these "vocal" faculty members would be in a good position to communicate this to other faculty members, thus hopefully engendering interest among the faculty for future meetings. (While randomization was an attempt to provide representativeness of opinion, it was always understood that the faculty members attending these meetings were representing nobody other than themselves.)
6. No press would be present or notified about these meetings in advance. This was an attempt to allow open and candid discussion in an environment divorced from the "threat of being quoted." The press, if they inquired, were informed that these meetings were private "rap" sessions between the governor and the faculty.

7. Meetings would take place on either a monthly or bi-monthly basis.

8. At least three meetings would be held during the remainder of the academic year, all of which would be assessed by this researcher.

The Governor agreed to these arrangements, and the first meeting was held in Santa Fe on February 4, 1971. Since that date, seven meetings have been scheduled, and an evaluation of this channel of communication is presented in the next section of this report.

I. Institute for Social Research and Development (ISRAD)

ISRAD was established at UNM by President Heady on July 1, 1968. It was formed as an administrative unit of UNM whose purpose was to coordinate the financial and human resources of the social science oriented programs at UNM which were promoting the economic and social development of New Mexico, the Southwest and the nation as a whole. In other words, ISRAD administers the research and development programs at UNM. ISRAD is financed primarily by federal grants (but does get some funds from local and state sources); the current operating budget is approximately $3 million. Currently ISRAD administers 11 programs (plus the main ISRAD offices):

1. Bureau of Business Research (BBR)

   This agency was formed in July, 1945, operating under a charter "to promote the economic well-being of New Mexico." It conducts three major programs: business and economic research, information services, and community development. It operates a data bank which is the largest source of social and economic information in the state. The Bureau issues various publications (e.g., New Mexico Business) and performs certain consultation services to individuals and communities. Current director of the Bureau is Lee Zink (who holds an appointment in UNM's Department of Economics), the staff is about 20, and the source of revenue is federal (HEW primarily), state (DOD, State Bar, etc.), and local.

2. Division of Government Research (DGR)

   This unit was also established in 1945. Its current budget is $14,500 and it has a staff of four. The current Director, John Hunger, serves 1/3 time with the Division, 1/3 time as Director of the Urban Observatory, and 1/3 time in the UNM

Political Sience Department. Most of the Division's funds come from state and federal sources. The Division publishes research on the government and politics of New Mexico, the Southwest, and the U.S. It also maintains a data bank of New Mexico election statistics since statehood. The Division also conducts training programs for government employees throughout the state.

3. The Technology Application Center (TAC)

TAC is one of six NASA regional information dissemination centers around the country. It has a budget of $158,000 from NASA, $25,000 from the state, and a small amount from UNM. The rest of its funds come from user fees. The staff of TAC is 29 employees (8 full-time and 21 part-time--13 undergraduates and 8 graduates). TAC's primary goal is to transfer NASA's technology to secondary users in the Rocky Mountain Region of the Southwest--primarily to business and industry. TAC has access to the nation's largest data banks: Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, ERIC, etc. TAC performs computer searches which result in information to solve local business and industrial problems, special bibliographies, current awareness searches to update data files, etc. TAC's current director is William Shinnick, who also holds an appointment in UNM's School of Business and Administrative Sciences.

4. Center for Environmental Research and Development

The Center is three years old, was inactive and without a director for one year, and recently hired a new director, Richard Anderson (who serves 2/3 of his time in the Department of Architecture). The total staff of the Center is one--Anderson--and the budget is approximately $3,000 (from ISRAD). Previously, federal funds (from the Office of Education) were available to sponsor some of the Center's projects. The Center works with government agencies and community organizations to provide technical assistance and counsulting services on problems related to our total environment (air and water pollution, housing systems, environmental education for the layman, land use patterns).

5. Center for Leisure and Recreation

The Center is also three years old, but has received funding for only the last two. Currently the budget is $17,000 (funds received from Title I), the staff consists of a director (E. A. "Swede" Scholer), 2 graduate assistants, and 2 work study secretaries. The director is on 1/4 release time from the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation at UNM. The Center is primarily concerned with consulting and planning in the area of recreation and leisure. Its clients are small communities, city parks, recreation programs, Indian tribes, government agencies, etc. Additionally, the Center conducts research on various factors influencing leisure and recreation.

6. Bureau of Revenue Training Program

In conjunction with the UNM School of Business and Administrative Sciences, the Bureau conducts training programs for employees of the New Mexico State Bureau of Revenue. These training programs emphasize accounting, organization theory and administration, communication, data processing and business law. The Bureau's first program began in April, 1969 and continued through 1970. Funds are received on a state contract basis (for services performed in training). Additionally, the Bureau conducts seminars and workshops around the state on tax education (for citizens of New Mexico). These workshops help familiarize the citizens of the state with recent changes in the tax laws among other topics. The staff of the Bureau is limited to its Director, Edwin Caplan (who is also a Professor in the UNM Department of Accounting); additional staff for the training programs are hired (usually from the UNM faculty) on a consulting basis.

7. The Comprehensive Child Care and Development Project

The program began in 1970 under a grant from HUD and HEW (recently the Carnegie Foundation provided some funding). The total budget for 1971 fiscal year was $421,000 (1/4 from Carnegie and 3/4 from HEW); these funds were assigned to ISRAD under a contract with the New Mexico Department of Health and Social Services. The staff of 30 is currently directed by James Jaramillo, former Director of the Albuquerque-Bernalillo County Economic Opportunity Board. The primary function of the project

is to operate five child day care centers in the Albuquerque Model Cities Neighborhoods (100 children/center--from infancy to age 10). At these centers the children participate in an innovative program emphasizing cognition, language development and social experience. The program also provides for teacher training and education for community personnel involved with the children. Additionally, the program has trained the United Child Care Inc. (UCCI) board, a corporation of Model Cities residents, to take over the operation. Local community control over the program, one of the original goals of the project, was accomplished this year.

8. College Enrichment Program (CEP)

Begun in 1968-9, CEP has as its immediate goal, the retention of disadvantaged students (primarily minority blacks, Chicanos and Indians) in UNM. The long range goal is to encourage them to go on to graduate school or the professions. When CEP began its operation, it received funding from OEO and later, the Office of Education. Currently CEP is funded by a state appropriation of $140,000. The staff consists of 3 (including its Director, Dan Chavez, who is also an Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations at UNM) plus 15-20 part-time tutors (who are paid $5/hour, for a maximum of 15 hours/week). CEP has specific goals (besides those already mentioned) for long-range planning: to increase the proportion of students at UNM from disadvantaged backgrounds; to assist disadvantaged students in successfully completing UNM programs (and later entering the professions--law, medicine, teaching, etc.--or graduate school); to assist the university in re-examining its attitudes, methods and practices as they affect disadvantaged students in such areas as recruitment, admission, financial aid, retention, counseling, tutoring, student personnel services, etc. In order to accomplish its goals, CEP recruits disadvantaged students from high schools; enrolls them in an intensive eight week summer program (concentrating on language arts and communication skills, logic and verbal expression, cultural awareness and the University; and monitors their course of studies at UNM, providing them with counseling, tutoring, financial aid, etc. Recently released statistics indicate that the program is succeeding in its immediate goal:

the original class (from 1969) of 45 students now has 32, a 71% retention rate (compared with a rate of 51% for the entire 1969 freshman class); the second class (from 1970) of 96 students still has 75, a 78% retention rate. In the fall of 1971, 94 additional students entered, thus bringing the total number of students still enrolled in the program to 201.

9. Human Resources Development Program

This program is actually a combination of three programs: Work Incentives Program, Career Opportunity Program, and Home Improvement Program. Work Incentives Program (WIP) aids mothers on welfare toward qualifying as regular jobholders. Women (referred by the Employment Securities Commission) are given a study plan to enable them to pass the GED (high school equivalency test), and to improve their communication skills. The ultimate goal of WIP is to assist the mother in becoming a contributing human resource, capable of assuming regular full-time employment. Career Opportunity Program (New Careers) enrolls approximately 100 people (from low-income areas of the city) in a joint classroom and on-the-job-training experience which culminates for the trainee in both a worthwhile job and an Associate of Arts degree (from UNM). Each trainee receives 10 hours/week of classroom instruction in regular UNM courses and 30 hours/week in OJT at any local agency, e.g., Albuquerque Public Schools, State Department of Health and Social Services, Bernalillo County Medical Health Center, and the Employment Security Commission. All wages of trainees are paid by federal monies during the first year of training; during the second year the government and the agency split the wages; during the third year the agency pays all wages. The Home Improvement Program (HIP) was formed in July, 1965 and was originally funded by OEO. High school dropouts (who can't get into any other program) who are legally classified as poverty stricken are selected from several hundred applicants for this program. They work two hours/day receiving basic education and training and six hours/day building and repairing homes (OJT) mostly located in Albuquerque barrios. They fix windows, repair roofs, etc. using materials provided by the homeowners (or private donors). All work is done in the trainees local community, and after training,

they are placed in local construction jobs. The entire staff for the three programs (WIP, New Careers, HIP), 26 people, is Chicano, except for the director, L. E. "Ned" Roberts, and his secretary.

10. Special Services Program

This is ISRAD's newest program, beginning during the last fall semester (1971). It is supported by a $90,000 grant from HEW and has a staff of two (Director: Facundo Valdez, and his assistant) plus several part-time tutors. The purpose of the program is to provide tutoring, counseling and advisory services to UNM undergraduate students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The students are counseled on problems of their current academic career and on matters of future career and professional decisions. Currently, approximately 300 students are enrolled in the program.

11. New Mexico Criminal Justice Program

In April, 1971, UNM announced a contract of approximately $300,000 with the U. S. Department of Justice, under its Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The purpose of the grant was to institute a program which would study, recommend to and improve the city and county criminal justice system. Albuquerque was one of ten cities chosen for this pilot project because of several factors: high crime rate, high drug abuse rate, large minority-group population, size of city (small enough to enable project to avoid high costs, yet large enough to have representative crime problems). Other sources of funding are being sought through grants to state and federal agencies. The current staff is composed of seven people, including its director, William Partridge. At a planning conference last November (1971), community leaders, representatives of police, court, corrections agencies, etc. gave top priority for 1972 to the reduction of property crime and to assure equal treatment of all persons by the criminal justice system.

In addition to the above 11 programs, ISRAD's main administrative offices house a communications director and a coordinator for Title I Funds. This latter officer, Everett Polanco, administers $126,000 (1971) from HEW, funds earmarked for community projects according to

priorities established by Mr. Polanco and Mr. Blumenfeld, Associate Director of ISRAD (after consultation with state and university advisory councils). For example, in 1971 the priorities were established as economic development and the environment. Under the UNM established lines of authority, ISRAD's director reports to the Vice-President for Research (George Springer). Since ISRAD is an administrative unit of UNM, it is the concern of this report in two areas: as a channel of communication between the university and its public and between the faculty and the administration. It was in both of these areas that ISRAD was evaluated in the next section of this report.

J. Miscellaneous Channels of Communication

Included in this category of university-public channels of communication are such university sponsored events as athletic contests (football, basketball, especially), cultural events (Popejoy Hall Series, Film Series, Speakers Series, etc.), popular entertainment events (rock concerts, etc.) which attract people from the community to the university. A winning basketball team, for example, can serve as a positive medium between the university and its alumni and supporters. The Lobo Club (made up of UNM athletic supporters) serves as an example of an organization outside the university which has a positive effect upon UNM communication with its public. The Vice-President for Student Affairs, when he sends mailings to parents of UNM students, is serving as a communication link to the public. Ethnic studies programs at UNM (Afro-American Studies, Chicano Studies, Native American Indian Studies, etc.) serve as a communication link between the university and minority groups in the community. The university has made a film (25 minutes) which deals with student activities--it is used primarily in local organizations and school groups. A new student activity at UNM last year was entitled, "Experiment in the Media," and it served as a channel of communication between the university and the community primarily by inviting selected business leaders to UNM (for one of the programs in the week) for an informal discussion with UNM students. Finally, the most useful channel of communication at the university is the human channel, composed of all human resources at UNM: students, faculty, administration, staff, etc. Every time a member of the university community interacts with a member of the New Mexico community, he is serving as an interpersonal link between UNM and the public. The success or failure of those interactions may well affect the university more than any of the above media.

K. UNM Public Opinion Poll

This channel was saved for last because at the time of this writing it was just being organized. This researcher is directing a statewide survey of attitudes of the New Mexico voting public to the university, its purposes and role. The survey will be financed by the UNM administration and will be limited, for political reasons, to those citizens in New Mexico who are registered to vote (as of June 1, 1972). Citizen attitudes toward UNM will be measured on such questions as: the desirability of a UNM education; the quality of UNM graduates as prospective employees, the satisfaction of the public with UNM's performance as a teaching, research, and service institution; etc. Answers to these (and other) questions will be analyzed according to variables as age, sex, level of education, geographic region, income level, occupation, etc. A more complete description of this survey appears in the next section of this report.

As was pointed out in the introduction of this report, evaluation of selected channels of communication will be limited to those few channels which are believed most relevant to successful university-public communication at UNM. In keeping with this position, the following section will contain an extensive evaluation of the following channels: D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference; Meetings of Governor King and UNM Faculty; ISRAD; and the UNM Public Opinion Poll.

II. Evaluation of Selected University-Public Channels of Communication

A. D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference

"What is this absurd wall between the thing called the University and the thing called the Community?" UNM Professor Joel Jones (American Studies) asked this question at the last D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conference of Community Leaders (October 29-31, 1971). The main purpose of these conferences has been to break down "this wall," to improve communication between UNM and its public. The conference last fall was the fourth one scheduled; reports on the previous three were highly favorable, both from participants and members of the press. The only disruption at any of the conferences occurred at the second one (October 11-13, 1968): At the opening session, six uninvited students (with activist reputations) appeared and demanded entrance to the conference; the participants voted to admit them, provided they conformed to the conference rules; they agreed and spent the weekend engaged in fruitful discussion. A second incident occurred during the next evening when a group of Brown Berets demanded to address the conference; they were allowed fifteen minutes to speak, during which time they also answered questions from the audience; their primary purpose was to discuss discrimination at UNM (against Chicanos).

The last conference was held October 29-31, 1971. Attenting the conference were 119 representatives of the community and the University: 51 community leaders (from Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Gallup, Las Cruces, Lovington, Tucumcari, Hobbs, Roswell and Farmington); 34 faculty and staff of the university (their wives are included in this figure); 34 students (wives included), both undergraduate and graduate. The students were selected by the respective student governments; the remainder of the participants were selected by a planning committee of the administration.

Prior to attending the conference, all participants were mailed a list of participants, a schedule of activities, a brief questionnaire asking for a preference on topics to discuss at the conference, and a map. Table 1 lists the proposed topics for discussion and tabulations of responses by the participants (totals exceed 119 because of multiple responses to discussion topics).

Table 1

Tabulation of Responses on Returned Questionnaires for D. H. Lawrence Discussion Topics

Topic	Comm. Ldrs.	Students	Fac/ Staff	Total
Are Colleges Helping to Solve Today's Problems?	25	12	6	43
What Does the Public Expect Out of Colleges?	17	15	11	43
New Trends in Academic Programs	22	16	7	38
What Do Students Expect Out of College?	15	10	7	37
Student Attitudes--Then and Now	13	8	8	29
Reverse Discrimination--Do We Have it in Colleges?	11	12	4	27
Intercollegiate Athletics--Their Future	10	9	7	26
Coed Dormitories--Pros and Cons	14	4	4	22
Limiting Enrollment--Must We?	8	7	7	22
The Current Drug Scene--Why?	12	3	4	19
Who Will Get the 18-Year Old Vote?	12	5	2	19

Other Topics Suggested

BBA and PhD in Business Administration (2)

Does University have Obligation to Provide Decent Housing for all Students? (2)

Ethnic Studies--Their Future

Student Publications

Student Regents

UNM Library

Legislative Funding Priorities

Administrative/Faculty/Student Communication

Table 2 presents a schedule of events planned for the conference.

Table 2

D. H. Lawrence Conference--Schedule of Events

Friday, October 29	
3:00-6:00 pm	Arrival, Room Assignment
6:00-7:00 pm	Dinner, Dining Hall
7:30-8:30 pm	General Session, Great Hall Welcome-President Heady Brief History of D. H. Lawrence Ranch, Sherman Smith Generator Session-Brief comments on several discussion topics by selected conference participants
8:45-9:30 pm	Group Discussions-Individual Meeting Rooms, Introductions, Selection of Group Leader and Group Recorder
Saturday, October 30	
7:30-8:30 am	Breakfast
8:45-10:30 am	Group Discussions
10:30-11:00 am	Coffee
11:00-12:30 pm	Free Time
12:30-1:30 pm	Lunch
1:45-3:00 pm	Group Discussions
3:00-5:00 pm	Free Time
5:30-7:00 pm	Steak Fry
7:30-9:00 pm	Individual Group Reports Presented
Sunday, October 31	
7:00-9:00 am	Breakfast
10:00-11:30 am	Open Forum-Panel of University Participants Available to Answer Questions
11:45-12:45 pm	Lunch Departure

Evaluation of such a conference can usually be accomplished by looking at both immediate and long-range objectives. An immediate goal of purposeful exchange of information (about the university and its role) among members of the university and its public was accomplished. The participants were divided into six discussion groups where more meaningful interaction could be accomplished than in one large group of 120. The groups were selected with an attempt to provide membership of all constituencies (faculty, staff, students, community leaders) while separating husbands and wives. Groups met for almost four hours during the weekend to discuss any topic from the list in Table 1 or any other topic of interest to the participants. The primary purpose of these groups was NOT to formulate policy or make specific recommendations; they were assembled to exchange viewpoints with the hope of achieving a better understanding of other positions on issues. Since the groups were limited in size to about 20, they were large enough to provide a multitude of inputs but small enough to encourage interaction among all participants. The groups met in small rooms (or portions of larger rooms) where they were isolated from other groups. The rooms had moveable chairs and noise from external sources was at a minimum.

Topics discussed varied from group to group (according to later reports) but one issue seemed to find favor in most groups--what are the differences in priorities between students and non-students in the goals of getting a college education? The main opinion expressed by students was that they saw value in an education "for its own sake," without striving for a specific goal, such as a job. Non-students (primarily from the community) expressed the view that an education should prepare students for jobs which contributed to the "social and political life of the community." Non-students questioned the value of the BUS degree at UNM; they saw this degree as potentially harmful to the above stated goal of "getting a job." Other areas where community leaders demonstrated a lack of understanding were the UNM ethnic studies programs and the Institute for Social Research and Development (ISRAD).

Informal reactions to the short-range objective (accomplishing meaningful interaction) may be summarized quite briefly. Comments by participants (interviewed by this researcher) were generally very positive on the entire conference. Specific comments centered on the "good food," the "excellent weather" (it snowed), the "comfortable cabins" (or the "uncomfortable dorms"), the

"separation of wives and husbands," "the fact that parking was not discussed," etc. in addition to the worthwhileness of the discussions and the opportunity to meet with the community leaders and the university leaders.

The two main suggestions which this researcher can offer to improve accomplishing the short-range goal are: reduce the amount of free-time from 3½ hours to 1½ hours in order to give more time (6 hours instead of 4) for group discussions and interfaces; secondly, I would suggest inviting more community leaders and fewer university leaders (to keep the cost at the same level) in order to use this medium of communication to reach the greatest number of influential community leaders. These two suggestions would improve the numbers and the quality, thus the overall effectiveness, of the channel of communication.

One possible long-range objective of this conference is to improve the attitude of community leaders (legislators, citizens, etc.) toward the University. Over a period of years, it may be possible to observe such parameters as: amount of legislative financial support; legislation aimed to curtail the autonomous operation of the University (or enhance it); numbers of students enrolled at UNM from outside Albuquerque; financial support from alumni, supporters and friends of UNM; etc. Of course, it would be statistically impossible to demonstrate causation between any of the above measures and participation in the D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conferences. However, research in the area of interpersonal trust informs us that conferences of this variety are one way to influence attitudes by building trust between and among groups of people. This may be illustrated by a statement made by one of the participants attending the second D. H. Lawrence Conference. He came to the conference as an outspoken critic of UNM. As he left, he stated,

> "In the past, if there have been some sparks between the Legion and the University, it was in good faith on the part of the Legionnaires, who believed that in an area for which they were responsible--New Mexico--there was possibly a challenge, possibly a jeopardy, rising to this cause and to this purpose. It's been dispelled in my mind this weekend and I am readily aware of it. I have seen your young people. I have worked with them, as all of us have. I have faith in them. I believe that the University is doing an excellent job and I do not mind being

quoted on that--I am proud to make that statement. I would be proud for a child of mine to attend this school in its present situation and, though my fears have not relaxed my vigilance either. . . My wife and I will go back (home) and will express ourselves. We will encourage our friends to consider sending their children to this fine school under the direction and tutelage of the people with whom we have associated this weekend. It will be an honor for us to do this."

Obviously, not all participants have left these conferences in such a euphoric state. However, this example demonstrates the potential effect that such a weekend can have on even the most outspoken critics of UNM. If criticism is based, in part, on a lack of information, then such conferences can certainly fill that need. If they are based on deep lack of trust (either for the University or for community leaders), then such conferences can only be a beginning to breaking down such barriers. One possible suggestion to measure some of the long-term effects of these conferences may be to send all participants a follow-up letter and questionnaire asking for such things as: suggestions to improve future conferences; their views on the worth of such conferences; their interest in attending future conferences; their current opinions toward the university; etc. Such an approach is not intended to be experimental (in the pretest-posttest sense of the word); it is merely intended to provide some feedback to planners of future conferences. One final criterion for assessing the impact of such conferences was suggested by President Heady at the close of the last conference: ". . . less time, attention and emphasis was spent (this year) on crises that people exercised hot about, and more talk was spent on educational issues. This is encouraging, it says we have come some distance."

Overall Conclusion for D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conference

The D. H. Lawrence Community Leaders' Conferences appear to be accomplishing their short-term objective of providing meaningful interaction between leaders of the University and leaders of the community. The logistics for these conferences (setting, format, food and lodging, etc.) help to contribute to this goal. Possible improvement in meeting the immediate goal may be realized by increasing both the number of community leaders and the amount of time spent in small group

discussion. Long-term objectives, such as improving outside attitudes toward the University, may be both harder to measure and achieve, however, initial results are quite encouraging (in terms of feedback on the effect the conference has had on influencing certain key leaders). It may be possible to better assess the long-term effect of such conferences by polling the participants for their reactions (6 months-one year after attending). In my opinion, these conferences should definitely be continued, and scheduled at least twice a year. In this way, a greater impact may be possible toward accomplishing any long-range goals.

B. Meetings of Governor King and UNM Faculty

Evaluation of the effectiveness of this channel of communication will be accomplished by selected subjective and objective measures. The former will be limited to faculty opinions (as determined by pre-post interviews and questionnaires), opinions of the Governor (obtained by interview), and actions by the Governor (which directly resulted from these meetings). The latter will be assessed by data generated from an interaction analysis of the first three meetings.

Two research questions were asked in this evaluation: Can a channel of communication between the Governor of New Mexico and the faculty of the University of New Mexico be created? and Will this channel be effective in producing meaningful interaction, in satisfying the morale, and in influencing the attitude of the participants? Much of the evaluation of this channel was done by Richard Dillender (as part of his Master's Thesis, directed by this author). Table 3 presents a summary of the seven meetings scheduled to date between the Governor and the selected UNM faculty members.

As can be seen by Table 3, six of the seven scheduled meetings were held, one of which was conducted by Lt. Governor Mondragon in the absence of Governor King. Most often discussed topics were faculty salaries, UNM's budget, the environment and the board of regents. After the third meeting an attempt was made to invite the Chairman of the Board of Regents (Calvin Horn) and one UNM Vice-President to each meeting. This was the result of suggestions made at the first three meetings by several faculty members desiring greater UNM administrative input at these meetings. The six meetings were attended by a total of 111 faculty members and Table 4 presents their

Table 3

Summary of Seven Scheduled Meetings
Between Governor and Faculty

Meeting	Date	Location	Number of Faculty	Key Issues Discussed
1	Feb. 8, 1971	Santa Fe	24	UNM Budget, Faculty Salaries, UNM Curriculum
2	April 28, 1971	UNM	14	Gun Control, LUSC, Environment
3	June 15, 1971	Santa Fe	14	Junior Colleges, Selection of New Board of Regents
4*	Sept. 24, 1971	UNM	19	Love Lust, Housing VISTA, Vietnam, Environment, Student as Regent
5	Nov. 17	Santa Fe	(Cancelled because of snow)	
6**	Jan. 14, 1972	UNM	21	Bilingual Education, Student Unrest, Black Studies, Athletics, Legislative Attitudes
7	March 16, 1972	UNM	19	Faculty Salaries, Teaching Loads, UNM Resources, BEF, Pollution, Jobs and Placement

*Attended by Calvin Horn and Harold Lavender

**Attended by Lt Governor Mondragon, Calvin Horn and George Springer

distribution by college. This researcher and the chairman of the Faculty Policy Committee (or his representative) were present at all meetings and are not included in the frequency count presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Distribution of Faculty by College

College (or School)	Number of Faculty (for six meetings)
Arts and Sciences	58
Education	19
Engineering	10
Fine Arts	8
Medicine	6
Business and Administrative Sciences	3
Law	3
Nursing	2
Pharmacy	2
Total	111

As has already been stated, an attempt was made to proportionally represent the faculty by college or school. Table 4 would seem to indicate that this goal was achieved. (Crude attempts were also made to represent the selected faculty by sex, rank and tenure at UNM, but the key criterion for selection was college or school affiliation.)

The two dependent variables measured in this evaluation were participant attitude (faculty attitude toward the governor, the governor's attitude toward the faculty, and both faculty and the governor's attitude toward the meetings) and quality of participant interaction (as determined by an interaction analysis).

The former was measured by a pre-post questionnaire (administered to the faculty) and a pre-post interview (given by the governor). Table 5 presents the pre-post questionnaire used to measure faculty attitude toward the governor and the meetings. Table 6 presents the results of these questionnaires. Table 7 presents the key interview questions (and answers) used to measure the governor's attitude.

Table 5

Pre-Post Questionnaire for Measuring Faculty Attitude

A. QUESTIONNAIRE BEFORE THE MEETING

1. Please rate your opinion of Bruce King's performance as Governor of New Mexico to date.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Bad	Bad	Fair	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

2. How would you rate, in your own opinion, the Governor's concern for university problems?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Bad	Bad	Fair	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

3. Do you feel that a need exists for better communication between the Governor and the university?

____Yes ____No ____No Opinion

Comments:

4. You will be participating in a meeting between the Governor and the University faculty. What results do you anticipate?

Table 5 (Cont'd)

B. QUESTIONNAIRE AFTER THE MEETING

1. Please rate your opinion of Bruce King's performance as Governor of New Mexico to date.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Bad	Bad	Fair	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

2. How would you rate, in your opinion, the Governor's concern for university problems?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Bad	Bad	Fair	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Comments:

3. Do you feel that the meeting with Governor King in which you recently participated was worthwhile?

____Yes ____No ____No Opinion

Comments:

4. Would you be willing to attend similar meetings in the future?

____Yes ____No ____No Opinion

Comments:

5. What suggestions do you have for future meetings of this nature? e.g., format, expansion to legislators, frequency, etc.

Table 6

Results of Faculty Pre-Post Questionnaire on Meetings

Question	Pre-questionnaire Mean (n=46) or frequency	Post-questionnaire Mean (n=39) or frequency
1	3.08	4.29*
2	3.25	4.57**
3	Yes-42, No-4	Yes-30, No-6, No Opinion-3
4	(Not summarized)	Yes-24, No-9, No Opinion-6

*t, $p<.05$; **t, $p<.05$

Table 7

Data Obtained on Governor King Before and After the Meetings

PRE-MEETING*

QUESTION	RESPONSE
1. Governor, what is your opinion of the faculty's job performance to date?	Very good. I'm real pleased with the work going on down there at the University.
2. Governor, what is your opinion of the faculty's concern for state problems?	Very good. There are a lot of faculty members active in committees and programs for the state.

* Data obtained during live interview with Governor King on January 20, 1971 (before first meeting).

POST-MEETING**

1. Governor, what is your opinion of the faculty's job performance to date?	Very good. They seem to be getting along real good there.
2. Governor, what is your opinion of the faculty's concern for state problems?	Very good. I've always been happy with the faculty at the University and their concern for the state.

** Data obtained after third meeting (on July 2, 1971).

The data in Table 6 indicate that the faculty's opinion of the Governor's performance improved significantly ($p<.05$) after participating in a meeting with the Governor (see question 1). Also, the faculty's opinion of the Governor's concern for university problems improved significantly ($p<.05$) after participating in a meeting with the Governor (see question 2). Other results of the pre-post questionnaire indicate that most (91%) of the faculty feel that a need exists for better communication between the Governor and the university (see question 3, pre); 77% of the faculty felt that the meeting with the Governor was worthwhile (see question 3, post); and 61% of the faculty would be willing to attend similar meetings with the Governor in the future (see question 4, post). Of course, these results are only intended to be generalizable to those faculty members who responded to the questionnaire. Only those faculty members attending the first three meetings were surveyed (n=52) and returns were received from 46 on the pre-questionnaire and 39 on the post-questionnaire. By agreement with the Governor, only those meetings were evaluated (as explained above).

The data from Table 7 were received in a highly subjective form and no statistical analysis could be performed. However, it would appear from the Governor's comments that his "stated" attitude or opinion toward the faculty of the university was apparently unaffected by these meetings. Since he is a politician, a better index of the effect of these meetings on his attitude might be his actual behavior toward the university and the faculty, rather than his words in an interview. Two possible behavioral criteria from which one might infer the effects of these meetings on the Governor might be his actions toward the university and his actions which can be directly traced to these meetings. Caution should be used in attempting to demonstrate causation on either of these criteria, but they are presented for further speculation. The first criterion (the Governor's actions toward the university) is reported from newspaper accounts during the time of the first three meetings. The following is a chronological listing of policy decisions concerning UNM in which Governor King was involved.

> February 12, 1971. $1,200,000 in state issued bonds were released for loans for approximately 500 students at UNM. This appropriation was obtained through the direct efforts of Governor King after initial reports that no money would be available. Governor King explained, when presenting a loan check to a student

recipient, that more funds should be available for students wishing to further their education. (UNM Lobo, February 16, 1971, p. 6)

February 17, 1971. The Governor appointed two new members to the UNM Board of Regents. The two new members were Calvin Horn and Austin Roberts. In the meetings with the Governor several faculty members voiced their approval of the Governor's appointments. The Governor explained that he chose the two men for their sincere concern for the University. (UNM Lobo, February 8, 1971, p. 1)

March 30, 1971. The BEF budget recommendation was reduced by $3.5 million for university appropriations (faculty salary increases). This decision prevented sufficient salary increases which were considered imperative for the faculty of UNM. Governor King said he was concerned with the status of faculty salaries, however, he evaded a statement of future plans. (Campus News, April 1, 1971, p. 1)

April 10, 1971. The LUSC was continued for one more year by Governor King to investigate university matters because the Governor felt that the committee had "changed its outlook, and would be helpful to the university." The Governor denied that the new LUSC purpose was similar to that of its creation, when it was designed to investigate student and faculty conduct at UNM. (UNM Lobo, April, 1971, p. 1)

These events do not indicate any possible trend on the Governor's part to form a pattern of policy toward UNM. However, they do indicate at least a publicly stated concern for UNM. Of more immediate concern to the effect of the meetings on the Governor's behavior might be the second criterion (actions by the Governor which can be directly traced to these meetings). In this case, the two pieces of evidence cited are: 1. his continued attendance and interest in these meetings (as stated by him and his staff and inferred by his attendance); and 2. his appointment of three committees (on the environment, on bilingual education, and on placement and jobs) directly concerned with problems discussed at these meetings. In the case of the third committee (jobs and placement, known as ACCEPT), the Governor has scheduled a state-wide conference to investigate the means by which UNM graduates can be lured to remain in New Mexico after graduation. With great caution, it may be concluded that the Governor has verbally shown concern toward UNM

and behaviorally demonstrated an interest toward some of the problems discussed at these meetings.

The second major means of evaluating the effectiveness of this channel of communication was accomplished by an interaction analysis. This analysis provided data to assess the second dependent variable in the evaluation, quality of participant interaction. For the purposes of this evaluation, interaction was defined as the oral expression or statement of a participant at the meetings (see Bostrom, 1970). According to Gouran (1969) statement is defined as a "continuous flow of language of a participant to the point at which another participant initiates." The quality of each statement was determined with the use of an adaptation of the Bales Interaction Analysis Index (1964). Table 8 presents this adaptation which was necessary to generate the desired qualitative and quantitative data. Essentially each statement by a participant was listed in one of the twelve categories shown in Table 8; then a value was assigned to each statement depending upon the quality of the statement, with +3 indicating the best, +2 indicating an average statement, and +1 indicating a below average statement. Four trained expert process observers were employed for this purpose; a later test of the inter-rater reliability indicated a reliability of .96 among the four raters. Therefore, it was possible to pool the data from the four raters. A contribution score for each participant was determined by subtracing the sum of the scores in the three categories which combine to form the negative reactions (categories 10, 11, 12 in Table 8) from the sum of the scores from the other nine categories. This total was then divided by the number of statements to give what has been defined as a contribution score. This score was intended to be a close representation of the contribution of the participant to the discussion of the meeting at which he attended.

Meeting 1 with the Governor was used to test the evaluation instrument and determine the inter-rater reliability. Meetings 2 and 3 were evaluated using the adapted Bales instrument (whose reliability was determined to be .96). An example of the scoring and analysis of an interaction is as follows: Professor Smith declares that he is strongly opposed to a resolution recently declared by Professor Jones. Professor Jones, in reply, declares that Professor Smith is nothing better than a "blind, narrow-minded fool." In this case, Professor Smith would receive a score of +3 in category 10

Table 8

ADAPTATION OF THE BALES INTERACTION ANALYSIS INDEX

1. Shows Solidarity												
2. Shows Tensions Release												
3. Agrees												
4. Gives Suggestion												
5. Gives Opinion												
6. Gives Orientation												
7. Asks for Orientation												
8. Asks for Opinion												
9. Asks for Suggestion												
10. Disagrees												
11. Shows Tension												
12. Shows Antagonism												

(disagrees), while Professor Jones would receive a +3 in category 12 (shows antagonism). These scores, both in the negative reaction section of the instrument, would be subtracted from the sum of the scores in the first nine categories.

Additional data generated by the interaction analysis enabled the computation of the send-receive ratio (ratio of messages sent to messages received), the index of centrality (ratio of 1-1 messages received and 1-group messages sent to the 1-1 receives for the whole group and the 1-group sends for the whole group), and the index of peripherality (the relationship between an individual's centrality and that of the most centeral person in the group). Each of these three indices (send-receive ratio, centrality index, and peripherality index) were computed for each participant in order to infer leadership roles and group satisfaction with the meetings. Research has shown that those participants with the highest index of centrality, lowest peripherality and highest send-receive ratios are also those most satisfied with a group (and tend to assume significant leadership roles for the group).

Results of the interaction analysis are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Results of the Interaction Analysis
(meetings 2 and 3)

Meeting	Mean Contribution Score	Value for t
2	*1.86 (n=14)	-.25 (not significant
3	1.90 (n=14)	

*3 = above average contribution; 2 = average contribution; 1 = below average contribution

The data in Table 9 indicate that the quality of interaction (based on pooled Bales contribution scores assessed by 4 process observers) was "average" and this was not significantly different between the two evaluated meetings. Other data from the send-receive ratios,

centrality and peripherality indices could not be presented in mean form because they relate to individual differences. However, it is apparent from this data that Governor King had the highest send-receive ratio, lowest index of peripherality and highest index of centrality. This simply means that the Governor talked more than any of the other participants. When his results are factored out, the most verbose faculty members were those occupying seats on key faculty committees. This means that they were probably more knowledgeable on the discussed issues than other participants.

Overall Conclusion for the Governor's Meetings with UNM Faculty

Based on the following pieces of evidence this researcher is concluding that the meetings between the Governor and the UNM faculty have met their pre-established goals (i.e., a channel of communication was established and it produced at least "average" (according to Bales' adapted instrument) interaction which had a significant effect on the attitudes of the participants:

1. The faculty's opinion of the Governor's performance improved significantly after participating in one meeting;
2. The faculty's opinion of the Governor's concern for university problems improved significantly after participating in one meeting;
3. 91% of the participating faculty felt that a need existed for better communication between the university and the Governor;
4. 77% of the participating faculty felt that the meeting with the Governor was worthwhile;
5. 61% of the participating faculty indicated they would be willing to attend similar meetings with the Governor in the future;
6. The Governor has verbally (see above Lobo and Campus News reports) shown concern toward UNM and behaviorally demonstrated an interest toward some of the problems discussed at these meetings (by setting up at least three committees to investigate some of these problems);
7. The quality of the interaction of the participants (according to the adapted Bales instrument) was "average" and did not differ significantly between the two evaluated meetings;

8. Interactions at these meetings were most frequeny for the Governor and faculty members on key faculty committees.

C. Institute for Social Research and Development (ISRAD)

Rather than separate this section on ISRAD into two parts (dealing with external communication and faculty-administration communication, both (plus information on ISRAD's internal communication) are presented in this one section of the report. The data reported here is based on interviews (conducted by this researcher) with all of the ISRAD directors and key administrative staff, selected faculty members and community leaders who have interacted with ISRAD units. The interviews were at first non-structured and then, in later rounds, were structured around three topics: ISRAD-community communication; ISRAD-faculty communication; ISRAD internal communication. Information was sought on current status of existing channels, problems with these channels, and recommendations for improvement. The interviews were conducted over a period of one year (1971-2) with an average of about 2½-3 hours spent with each interviewee (either in one or repeated interviews). A total of 39 interviews were conducted with 30 people. During and shortly after the data collection period, certain administrative changes were made in ISRAD which may have affected some of the findings: appointment of an ISRAD executive committee (according to a new ISRAD operational charter); resignation of Jack Campbell as Part-time Director of ISRAD; appointment (after an extensive search) of Grace Olivarez as the new ISRAD Director; resignation of Art Blumenfeld (effective after summer, 1972) as Associate Director of ISRAD.

1. ISRAD-Community Communication

Most of the current ISRAD external communication program emphasizes written media. The ISRAD Newsletter is mailed quarterly to 6,000 people mostly in New Mexico (state and local government officials, a few federal people, community leaders, chamber board members, professional and civic groups, etc.). The ISRAD Annual Report is mailed to approximately 2,500 decision-makers and community leaders. Other agency publications are primarily documents from individual programs; e.g., the BBR published monthly New Mexico Business which is subscribed to by many business leaders in the state; the DGR has published such individual reports as Consumer Protection in New Mexico by David Hamilton, etc. Other

channels used by ISRAD leaders are the Speakers' Bureau and the normal interactions between an ISRAD unit and any one of its users in the community. During the interviews the following problems with this aspect of ISRAD (community communication) became evident:

a. Some of the directors complained that they were inhibited from extensive external communication by certain administrators of ISRAD whose philosophy they perceived as "limited external dialogue between the ISRAD Directors and outside sources (especially the press) limits follow-up explanations and clarifications due to distortions and misunderstandings." Even if this perception is more apparent than real, if it prevents or inhibits external communication between ISRAD and its community, then this may be quite harmful to the image of ISRAD.

b. ISRAD has a limited feedback system to effectively measure the success of any of its written media (or many of its programs). One input relied upon quite heavily for this purpose is the number of requests for publications and/or program services.

c. Since many of ISRAD's development programs are in the community limelight, they receive much attention from government leaders, community leaders, potential ISRAD critics, media sources, etc. Therefore, when an issue arises with one of the programs, it potentially may receive much publicity, usually adverse. Such was the case with the Child-Development controversy (October-November, 1971) centering on delays in turning over control of the program to the community and on the hiring of outside consultants to conduct sensitivity training sessions for the Child Development staff. Much of the publicity associated with this controversy referred to ISRAD as the "culprit" as opposed to the ISRAD unit involved in the situation. For example, an editorial in the Albuquerque Journal (October 21, 1971) stated,

> "Scandolous is hardly an adequate word to describe the situation in which the University of New Mexico's Institute for Social Research and Development is paying $200-a-day consultant fees . . .

> There is no justification for ISRAD to pay fees double that amount ($100/day). . . The time is past when we need to get on with solving poverty problems and we darn sure aren't going to do it by hiring more consultants and administrators." (P.A-4)

Nowhere in this editorial was reference made to the Child Development center; only ISRAD received the blame for this "scandal." The reverse logic seems to be the case when positive publicity is received by an individual program. It is the program (or unit) which is applauded not ISRAD. Two Directors who were very much aware of this problem stated that they would be inhibited in performing their work if many of their users associated them (their programs) with ISRAD. It appears, therefore, that ISRAD usually is the recipient of bad publicity but the program within ISRAD may get the favorable publicity.

d. ISRAD's three libraries (data banks at DGR, BBR, TAC) are not in use as much as their directors (and other ISRAD administrators) feel they could be. This may be true of some of the other programs within ISRAD (where more users could be justified).

Based on data received in the interviews and my own observations, I would like to make the following recommendations which may improve ISRAD-community communication.

a. Directors and other ISRAD administrators should be encouraged to develop extensive channels of communication between their program and potential users, media sources (to inform them about program achievements, etc.), and influential community leaders and decision-makers. This autonomy (based on interpersonal trust of employees) may improve ISRAD's external communication by increasing the number of potential channels. This recommendation is not intended as a means of bypassing normal ISRAD internal channels as much as it is intended to develop new external channels.

b. In order to better assess the reaction of the community to ISRAD programs and units (in advance of crises), advisory boards composed of community

leaders, potential users, key decision-makers, etc. should be set up for each unit. Their sole function should be advisory (not control) in the area of defining objectives and needs for each program. In this way, local input would be directly solicited and possible friction (after-the-fact) may be avoided. Precedence for this type of action within ISRAD exists in the Title I program (administered by ISRAD) for the State of New Mexico. A "University Council" was instituted (December, 1971) to directly assess the needs in terms of projects, priorities, etc. for each of the nine public universities in New Mexico. Additionally, a state advisory council (composed of state leaders) helps determine state-wide needs for these grants. After input is received from both advisory councils, the proposal review committee (and certain ISRAD administrators) determine which proposals get funding. Another example occurred in the Criminal Justice Program's recent Police-Community Attitude Survey where community groups were directly involved in determining what priority areas needed surveying (e.g., drug use, property crime, police brutality, etc.). As a result of this input, the survey was meeting needs of the community as well as the research team. The former example calls for a formal channel of communication to provide feed-back from the community to ISRAD; the latter example is more flexible and informal. Either one or both may be needed depending on the nature of the ISRAD unit. Another variant of the advisory board concept may be an annual retreat between members of the ISRAD unit and its principal users (or potential users). Such a program was employed by the Criminal Justice Program in November, 1971 when 40 community leaders (in the field of criminal justice) and certain CJP staff members attended a retreat in Santa Fe to determine the primary objectives of the CJP. An example of their conclusions is stated in the following resolution:

> "The principal objective of the 1972 Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Criminal Justice improvement plan shall be the development of a system-wide program for the reduction of property crime. This program shall include related high priority improvements in the areas of prevention, enforcement, prosecution, the courts and corrections . . ."

In sum, this recommendation offers three possible means of assessing feedback: a formal advisory council, informal community inputs, retreats and goal planning conferences. Any one or all of these channels are recommended for all ISRAD units. (In addition to community input, ISRAD programs which interact within the community should seek to develop local community control over their programs; e.g., the UCCI took over the operation of the Child Development Center.)

c. ISRAD units should conduct individual or joint (more than one unit cooperating) workshops throughout the State of New Mexico. This channel would bring ISRAD to the State in a positive manner, would serve to integrate ISRAD programs (thus reducing "umbrella" concept), increase the contacts between ISRAD and State agencies, business groups, etc. The precedent for such a massive effort exists with the Bureau of Revenue State Tax Workshops (conducted annually for the last three years) which most recently drew over 400 participants from five cities in the state. (The Leisure and Recreation Center recently attracted over 200 participants to Albuquerque for a workshop of swimming-pool operation.) Other possible workshops (suggested by one ISRAD administrator) could be on: consumer-protection laws; small business aids; medicare-medicaid; federal taxes; drug abuse; environmental law and regulation; etc. Of major importance in this channel of communication is the opportunity for ISRAD to receive positive publicity as well as integrate its programs through these joint efforts.

d. The three data banks (BBR, DGR, TAC) should find new ways to attract users. For example, TAC is now in the process of hiring an administrator whose prime function will be to market TAC's services and data banks.

2. <u>ISRAD-Faculty Communication</u>

Currently ISRAD is operating from its new charter which was developed by a faculty sub-committee and agreed to by the entire faculty and UNM administration and regents. Within this charter are provisions for the ISRAD Executive Committee whose membership includes five faculty members, for joint-appointment of faculty to both

ISRAD and academic departments, and for faculty-ISRAD research projects (initiated by the faculty member, ISRAD, or an outside sponsoring agency). Many of the problems cited in the following section of this report could probably have been eliminated or reduced if this charter were in operation when they occurred. They are still mentioned now because of their impact on the current communication status and interpersonal trust status between ISRAD and the faculty. Additional problems are pointed out because they may not have been handled in this new charter.

a. Aside from the executive committee, no formal communication channel exists between ISRAD and the faculty. Only certain faculty members are involved in ISRAD projects (last year 46 faculty served in either full-time or part-time capacity: Medicine - 1; Law - 1; B&AS - 7; Education - 16; A&S - 21). Most faculty are unaware of what ISRAD is, does or involves. For example, before the charter went into effect (and possibly the catalyst which resulted in the formation of the investigation committee which produced the charter), certain members of the faculty complained at an open faculty meeting that the first news they received about openings in a new ISRAD program (CJP) was in either trade journals or the local newspapers.

b. Possibly as a function, in part, of the above problem, there exists much mistrust between several faculty members and ISRAD. Many stated in interviews that they didn't trust the ISRAD Director, couldn't understand why he was there, didn't understand how some ISRAD directors could be hired without being traditional academic types. This mistrust exists in the other direction also. Many directors stated that faculty appear interested only in the "action" (research grants, consulting fees, assistants, etc.) and not in the community. The appointment of the executive committee has increased the mistrust; several directors view the committee as a "witch-hunt committee--out to get us and our programs . . ." Other possible contributing factors to this mutual mistrust are: delay on draft 4 of the charter and the lack of communication cited above.

c. One problem with faculty-ISRAD involvement is the ISRAD need for immediacy of commitment and faculty need for overload payment; faculty,

because of their other duties, may not be always available for an immediate commitment, and overload payment is not encouraged by the administration.

d. ISRAD and the faculty have not taken steps to develop areas of common ground (multiple joint appointments, course offerings in specialized areas, internship programs, workshops on grants, etc.). Instead, the emphasis has been on the faculty seeking research opportunities (and in "controlling" ISRAD, according to many directors), and ISRAD attempting to screen out most faculty and only contact and involve those they trust (according to several faculty members).

e. The formal lines of communication involving ISRAD connect ISRAD to the V. P. for Research, bypassing the faculty, and thus making ISRAD an administrative unit of the university.

f. The overall communication effort between ISRAD and the faculty has been characterized by limited departmental visits, mailings and reports at faculty meetings and committees. In sum, little has been done operationally in the past to involve faculty participation in ISRAD's programs or inform faculty members about ISRAD.

The following recommendations are offered to improve ISRAD-faculty communication and relate to three areas: information to the faculty, input from the faculty, and involvement of the faculty:

a. A major effort should be immediately undertaken by ISRAD to inform faculty members about ISRAD. The following media are suggested for such a campaign: personal visits to each academic unit by a team of ISRAD administrators and directors (the responsibility can be divided among the entire ISRAD team, but despite the time commitment, the payoff from personal contacts at the departmental level will justify this commitment; monthly (or bi-monthly) reports should be given at the general faculty meeting by the ISRAD Director; key faculty committees should be given regular reports on key ISRAD developments (by an Associate Director of ISRAD); individual ISRAD program directors should make monthly reports on their programs to relevant faculty departments (e.g., the Director of the

Center for Recreation monthly reports to the HPER faculty. As can be seen by this recommendation, the major thrust of this campaign will be personal contact and not written media. A newsletter is not the answer to this problem. It is a convenient cop-out by those who do not fully understand interpersonal communication and interpersonal trust.

b. ISRAD should immediately begin to solicit feedback and input from the faculty in determining program needs and directions. Joint appointments (as discussed in the ISRAD charter) are helpful in creating liaisons between departments and ISRAD for that purpose. Another possibility is personal mailings seeking advice and interest from faculty members (as done by the Center for Environmental Research and Development). In November, 1971 the director sent a memo to all deans, department chairman, faculty and administrators in order to compile a

> "list of faculty members who have interests in environmental studies and would welcome opportunities to participate in inter-disciplinary research activities should the Center receive particular grants or proposals in which they might be interested. Such a directory of interested personnel would enable the Center to identify and mobilize research teams to conduct research on a broad range of environmental problems."
>
> "In addition to the development of this directory, we would like to establish a program of regularly scheduled meetings so that members would have an opportunity to discuss their work and/or be able to draw upon the talents or resources of other colleagues in handling research problems."

Response to this memo has been somewhat encouraging; over 75 faculty members expressed an interest in this program. Another possible channel for accomplishing this purpose of getting input from the faculty might be similar to the suggestion already made for community-ISRAD communication--establish a set of advisory boards. At best, each program of ISRAD would have its own board which would be composed of faculty members from departments relevant to a particular program.

If too much "red tape" appears imminent from both this board and the community board, perhaps a joint faculty-community board could be established.

c. ISRAD should immediately create opportunities for creating greater faculty involvement in its programs. The new charter specifies ways of involving faculty members in projects originated by the faculty member, ISRAD or an outside agency. Additional direct involvement might be possible via the following: university curriculum could be integrated with some of the ISRAD programs (as done by the Center for Recreation); internships for students (or practicums) could be offered to interested departments; direct faculty fellowships could be made available for related faculty research (as done by DGR); workshops could be offered to faculty on topics of interest to both the faculty and ISRAD (e.g., "the art of grantsmanship or proposal writing"); research support services should be made available to faculty doing research in ISRAD programs (secretarial support, space, etc.).

In sum, these recommendations offer the opportunity to better inform and be informed by the faculty as well as involving them in ISRAD.

3. ISRAD Internal Communication

Originally it was not the expressed purpose of this author to study the internal communication of ISRAD. However, after the interviewing program began it became apparent that some of the internal communication problems of ISRAD were directly affecting both ISRAD-faculty and ISRAD-community communication effectiveness. Mention will only be made, therefore, of those problems which directly (or in some, indirectly) relate to the major thrust of this report.

a. Until the recent appointment of Grace Olivarez to Director of ISRAD, no full-time director existed in the organization. This put the burden of running the organization upon the Associate Director (Art Blumenfeld) which greatly limited his time in terms of external communication efforts between the faculty or the community. This was also one factor cited by several directors which they believed affected their job morale. The fact that their director was only

part-time and his boss (the V. P. for Research) was also part-time (and part-time Dean of the Graduate School) was perceived by many directors as evidence of a lack of concern for ISRAD within the UNM administration.

b. ISRAD's rapid growth ($400,000 in 1968 to over $3,000,000 today) has contributed to many internal problems which have affected external communication: "umbrella" concept of ISRAD which resulted in ISRAD programs operating autonomous from ISRAD; poor horizontal communication within ISRAD which lowered morale and also affected the "umbrella" concept; poor logistics (buildings were separated all over campus and the city) which further contributed to this idea.

c. ISRAD directors have their primary loyalty to their own program and funding or sponsoring agency rather than to the concept of ISRAD. As mentioned above, this inhibits good external communication because bad publicity goes to "ISRAD" and good publicity goes to the program.

d. Although it is hard to say which caused which, the poor morale of the directors has either increased this autonomy concept or been caused by it. Other contributing factors (to the low morale) seem to be: poor or absent leadership from above; lack of tenure (for several directors); lack of contracts; lack of evaluation and firing criteria; perceived censorship of external communication between directors and outside sources (press, government or private agencies, etc.); lack of input into decisions affecting ISRAD as a whole; lack of objectives and goals for ISRAD as a whole; fear of executive committee (as a controlling body).

The following <u>recommendations</u> are made to improve the internal communication problems at ISRAD:

a. Establish a program of quarterly or bi-annual retreats with the ISRAD executive committee and the ISRAD directors. These sessions could be informal goal-planning or needs-analysis conferences which might help improve horizontal communication within ISRAD as well as build the image of ISRAD as a totality rather than a series of segments.

b. If ISRAD directors are all given academic rank, this would solve some of their grievances about contracts, evaluation, promotion criteria and tenure. Salaries, of course, would have to be comparable to all other academic units on campus if this were done. Additionally, they should be allowed and encouraged to teach courses in their specialty areas; this would further improve communication between them and the faculty and students.

c. The task of conducting joint workshops (cited above in the community section) would also help build internal ISRAD unity around the team concept rather than the individual effort.

Overall Conclusions for ISRAD

It is apparent from the above information that ISRAD has had its problems which have had limiting effects upon ISRAD's external and internal communication effectiveness. The community and the faculty have been primarily informed about ISRAD via written media. Little or no attempts have been made by ISRAD to solicit feedback from either faculty or community. Involvement in ISRAD programs has been limited to those few faculty members who are determined most central to ISRAD's programs. Internal problems in communication and administration have created morale problems among the directors which have greatly affected the communication system.

Despite these problems of the past, there is still a great potential for improving the functioning of ISRAD as a channel of communication both between the university and its public and between the faculty and the UNM administration. It was with this purpose that the above recommendations were given.

It is my opinion that the university has been missing one of the greatest opportunities it has had to gain the support and sympathy of the community. A well organized, strongly committed and integrated ISRAD could help combat (especially over long periods of time) such problems as "love-lust", student unrest, irrelevant curriculum, etc. Through this medium of communication much misunderstanding and mistrust could be eliminated.

D. UNM Public Opinion Poll

This section of the report will present the methodology and results of the UNM Public Opinion Poll; recommendations based on the results of this poll will be presented in the next section of the report. The concept of a statewide survey to poll the attitudes of New Mexico's population toward the University was discussed in an interview between this author and the Director of the Bureau of Business Research (November, 1971). Specifics of such a study were not discussed at this time, but it was agreed that an attitudinal study would be worthwhile to the University in assessing the extent to which public agreed with the University's perception of its stated goals. Further interviews with University officials confirmed their interest in such a report and revealed the areas they wished questioned (V. P. for Administration and Development, Public Information Officer, Director of Placement). After the initial round of interviews was conducted, Mr. Hilary Horan of the Department of Speech Communication agreed to conduct the survey (under the direction of this author) for his Master's thesis. The objectives of this survey were defined as:

1. To increase the public's interest and support of the University through the participative process;
2. To discover areas in which the University is deficient in projecting a favorable image to the voting public (which was later defined as the population to be surveyed);
3. To accurately measure the voting public's opinion of the University;
4. To help justify the University's fiscal (and prima facie) existence to the legislature as a publicly supported institution of higher education.

In sum, the overall purpose of this survey was to create a channel for feedback which could provide an accurate indication of public opinion toward the University of New Mexico. With this information UNM would be in a better position to reinforce positive attitudes and change negative attitudes.

Methodology

After much discussion it was decided to use the voting lists (as of June 1, 1972) of New Mexico as the population for the survey (N=408,432). The rationale for this decision is as follows:

1. Census data is available only in summary form;
2. City and county directories do not reflect mobility of population (according to previous ISRAD research);
3. Telephone directories discriminate against certain population segments;
4. State legislators (who determine UNM's budget) are responsible directly to the voters.

A stratified random sample was systematically generated from each of the New Mexico county's voting lists (using a random numbers table). The sample was stratified by county in order to validly represent each region of the state. After consultation with the parties interested in the survey, it was agreed that the 95% level of confidence and ±5 standard error units would be acceptable to reliably and validly represent the population with the smallest return and lowest cost. The required sample return to allow the above error and confidence level is 384. A translation of the above information means that 95% of the time, we can be sure that our findings are within ±5% of the actual public attitude; e.g., if the population is actually 80% supportive of UNM on a specific criterion, 95 out of 100 times that this study would be repeated, the findings should show the public's attitude to fall between 75-85% (standard error of 5) supportive. Since previous mail questionnaire surveying in New Mexico has yielded a return rate of 12-15%, a sample of 3,000 subjects was randomly selected from the voting lists and mailed the questionnaire.

The measuring instrument was composed of demographic, informational and attitudinal items. Demographic data was necessary to test the representativeness of the sample (in terms of the population) and to later cross-tabulate certain independent variables with key demographic (dependent) variables. Informational questions were intended to reveal any sources of misconception among the population about the University. The attitudinal items were intended to measure the public's overall attitude toward the University. The questionnaire was devised after input was received from the primary sponsors of the survey. A copy of this measuring instrument appears in Table 10.

Table 10

Opinion Poll

Please fill in or check space where appropriate.

1. Home Zip code _____

2. Your age: Under 21 yrs._____; 21-30_____; 31-40_____
   41-50_____; over 50_____.

3. Your sex: 1. _____Male 2. _____Female

4. Your marital status:

   1. _____Married, living with spouse
   2. _____Legally married but separated
   3. _____Divorced
   4. _____Widowed
   5. _____Single, never married

5. Your racial or ethnic classification:

   1. _____Native American or Indian (tribe or pueblo:_____)
   2. _____Hispano, Mexican American or Chicano
   3. _____Black
   4. _____Oriental
   5. _____Other

6. How long have you lived in New Mexico? _____years

7. What was the last grade or year that you completed in school? _____years

8. How much education did you complete? 1. _____high school; 2. _____two yr. college; 3. _____University; 4. _____Graduate

9. Please describe as specifically as possible your occupation (e.g., owner & manager of grocery store; dispatcher at transit company; mechanic at car clinic)

   _____

   _____

Table 10 (Cont'd)

10. Approximate annual income: $_____

11. Are you directly connected with UNM in any of the following ways:

    1. _____Student 2. _____Parent of Student

    3. _____Employee 4. _____Alumnus

    4. _____no connection 6. _____other_____

12. Political party preference: 1. _____Republican

    2. _____Democrat 3. _____Other

13. Is it your understanding that UNM is an institution of:

    teaching 1. _____yes 2. _____no

14. research 1. _____yes 2. _____no

15. community service 1. _____yes 2. _____no

16. Do you feel that UNM <u>should</u> be an institution of:

    teaching 1. _____yes 2. _____no

17. research 1. _____yes 2. _____no

18. community service 1. _____ 2. _____no

19. Do you feel that UNM provides adequate service to the State with regard to:

    teaching 1. _____yes 2. _____no

20. research 1. _____yes 2. _____no

21. community service 1. _____yes 2. _____no

22. On the whole, do you believe that UNM provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the state?

    1. _____yes 2. _____no 3. _____no opinion

23. If you are in an employer's position (with available jobs), are you interested in interviewing UNM graduates for a job with your company?

    1. _____yes 2. _____no 3. _____not an employer

24. If you have had an opportunity to evaluate the work of UNM graduates, how would you rate their capability on this scale? (If no contact, leave blank)

    very low _____ _____ _____ _____ _____very high
    1 2 3 4 5

Table 10 (Cont'd)

25. Would you attend UNM if you had the opportunity?
    1. _____yes 2. _____no 3. _____no opinion

26. Would you like your children to attend UNM?
    1. _____yes 2. _____no 3. _____no opinion

27. Are you aware of any benefits of UNM research or service in your community?
    1. _____yes 2. _____no 3. _____no opinion

28. Where do you obtain most of your information about UNM? (please check one)
    1. _____newspaper
    2. _____television
    3. _____radio
    4. _____Channel 5 specifically
    5. _____"UNM Reports" specifically
    6. _____students
    7. _____friends
    8. _____alumni publications
    9. _____other_____

29. Please number, in order of importance to you, the fields of interest at UNM about which you would like to know more.
    _____teaching _____community service
    _____research _____other_____

30. On the whole, how satisfied are you with UNM?

very satisfied	fairly satisfied	uncertain or no opinion	somewhat dissatisified	very dissatisfied

31. Were you aware of events on the UNM campus May 9-13, 1972?
    _____yes _____no

32. How has this affected your response to this questionnaire?
    _____positively _____negatively _____no effect

As can be seen in Table 10, key demographic data includes: geographic area of residence, age group, sex, social status, affiliation with UNM, political party affiliation. Key informational items measure: respondents awareness of UNM as an institution of teaching, research and service; sources by which subjects obtain their information about UNM; awareness of UNM benefits to the community in teaching, research and service; knowledge of recent campus disturbances. Key attitudinal items included: respondents opinion of UNM as an institution of teaching, research and service; opinion of UNM graduates as future employees; respondents' desire to attend UNM or allow their children to attend UNM; overall opinion of respondents toward UNM.

The cost of the survey approached $500 and was shared by the Vice President for Administration and Development, the Bureau of Business Research, the Placement Center and the Public Information Office. Items of primary expense were: postage, printing, computer programming, xeroxing, and secretarial assistance.

The questionnaire was devised and revised in the Spring of 1972. The sample was generated and the questionnaires were printed and mailed in May, 1972. Returns were received and coded onto computer cards during June, 1972. Final returns were 388 questionnaires; analysis by frequency and cross-tabulation was based on this return.

Results

1. Demographic Data

The sample was examined to test its representativeness in terms of geographic location. A chi-square goodness-of-fit test revealed no significant difference between the percent of returns from each county and the percent of registered voters (according to the Secretary of State) in each county. It was thus concluded that the sample was truly representative of the state on the variable of geographic place of residence. The only other demographic variable for which population data was available (for registered voters) was party affiliation. A comparison of registered Republicans and Democrats with those in the sample revealed no significant difference on this variable, thus it was assumed that the sample was representative of the population on the variable, party affiliation. Table 11 presents a summary of other demographic data.

Table 11

Summary of Demographic Data of Return Sample (n=388)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Age	Under 21	20	5.2
	21-30	78	20.2
	31-40	81	20.9
	41-50	83	21.4
	Over 50	125	32.3
	No answer*	1	
Sex	Male	264	68.2
	Female	123	31.8
	No answer	1	
Ethnic Classification	Native American or Indian**	57	14.7
	Hispano, Mexican-American or Chicano	45	11.6
	Black	3	.8
	Oriental	0	0
	Other***	282	72.9
	No answer	1	
Marital Status	Married	311	80.7
	Married, Separated	6	1.6
	Divorced	18	4.7
	Widowed	11	2.9
	Single	39	10.1
	No answer	3	
Length of Residency in New Mexico	1-2 years	9	2.3
	3-5 years	31	8.1
	6-10 years	50	13.0
	11-15 years	43	11.2
	Over 15 years	252	65.4
	No answer	3	
Highest Grade Completed in School	Advanced Degree	84	22.0
	College Graduate	83	21.7
	Partial College or Technical School	89	23.3
	High School	101	26.4
	Partial High School	14	3.7
	Junior High School	10	2.6
	Less than 7 years	1	0.3
	No answer	6	

* "No answer" frequencies were not computed in percent column.
**This % is higher than might be expected because the phrasing of the question apparently confused several respondents, especially Anglos.
***This category was meant to include Anglos.

Table 11 (Cont'd)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Level of Education Completed	High School	105	28.9
	Two year college	80	22.0
	University	89	24.5
	Graduate	89	24.5
	No answer	25	
Hollingshead's Index of Social Status	Class I	58	15.1
	Class II	96	25.1
	Class III	90	23.5
	Class IV	111	29.0
	Class V	28	7.3
	No answer	5	
Approximate Annual Income	Below $4,000	42	13.0
	$4,000-6,000	32	9.9
	6,000-8,000	39	12.1
	8,000-10,000	34	10.5
	10,000-12,000	48	14.9
	12,000-15,000	50	15.5
	15,000-25,000	53	16.4
	Over 25,000	25	7.7
	No answer	65	
Connection with UNM	Student	14	3.6
	Parent of Student	32	8.3
	Employee	8	2.1
	Alumnus	39	10.1
	No connection	270	69.9
	Other	23	6.0
	No answer	7	
Political Party Preference	Republican	133	34.9
	Democrat	189	49.6
	Other	59	15.5
	No answer	7	

As can be seen from Table 11, the return sample was mostly white, married males who have lived in New Mexico over 15 years, completed at least a high school degree, have no connection with UNM, are mostly democrats in the middle and upper-middle class (socio-economically), and mostly over 40 years old.

The remainder of the questions can be classified into either informational or attitudinal categories. The questions will be presented with the responses to them

(in frequency and percent form). The results of each question were cross-tabulated with the demographic variables: geographic place of residence, age, sex, social status, affiliation with UNM, and political party affiliation. [The criterion for computing a cross-tabulation on a question (or set of questions) was arbitrarily set as a response distribution of 70%/30%. Distributions exceeding this arbitrary criterion were assumed to be skewed in such a way as to make additional analysis meaningless (given the size of the sample).] These data will not be presented because of space limitations, but their results will be mentioned. (Interested parties may receive complete copies of the data of this survey by contacting this researcher.)

2. Informational Questions

Question: Is it your understanding that UNM is an institution of

Teaching? Yes-360 (93%) No-27 (7%)

Research? Yes-292 (75.5% No-95 (24.5%)

Community Service? Yes-217 (56.7%) No-166 (43.3%)

Most of the sample were aware of UNM's teaching and research functions; however, a large segment were unaware of UNM's community service function (43.3%). This question was cross-tabulated with the above mentioned demographic variables (but the questions on teaching and research were not cross-tabulated because they did not meet the previously established criterion of 70%/30% maximum spread on the distribution).

Place of residence proved to be a significant variable on this question. Respondents from the following counties were LEAST aware of UNM's community service function: Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Lincoln, Otero, Lea, McKinley, San Juan. Age and connection with UNM were also significant. The older the age group, the lower the percentage who have a positive understanding of this aspect of UNM; also, those with direct contact with UNM were significantly more aware of this function than those with no contact. Other demographic variables were not significant.

Question: Do you feel that UNM should be an institution of

Teaching? Yes-377 (98.4) No-6 (1.6%)

Research? Yes-326 (90.1%) No-36 (9.9%)

Community Service? Yes-301 (86.7%) No-46 (13.3%)

Most of the sample believed that UNM should maintain the three functions of teaching, research and community service. No cross-tabulations were computed because of the skewed distributions.

Question: Are you aware of any benefits of UNM research or service in your community?

Yes-142 (36.7%) No-192 (49.6%)

No Opinion-53 (13.7%)

Since almost half of the sample claimed to be unaware of benefits of UNM research or service in their community, these data were cross-tabulated with the key demographic variables. The three variables which were significant were: place of residence, connection with UNM, and political party affiliation. The BEST informed counties on this question were: Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia, Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Taos, McKinley. Those respondents connected with UNM were more aware of these benefits (78%) than those with no connection (28%). Democrats were more aware than Republicans. Other variables were not significant but there was a tendency for respondents under 21 years old to know more about research and service benefits; also, the higher income brackets reported less awareness on this question than the others. Although sex was not significant alone as a variable, when coupled with place of residence, men were more knowledgeable than women.

Question: Where do you obtain most of your information about UNM?

Newspaper	Yes-245 (63.1%)	No-143 (36.9%)
Television	Yes-181 (46.6%)	No-207 (53.4%)
Radio	Yes-87 (22.4%)	No-301 (77.6%)
Channel 5 Specifically	Yes-60 (15.5%)	No-328 (84.5%)
"UNM Reports"	Yes-19 (4.9%)	No-369 (95.1%)
Students	Yes-122 (31.4%)	No-68.6%)
Friends	Yes-101 (26.0%)	No-287 (74.0%)
Alumni Publications	Yes-34 (8.8%)	No-354 (91.2%)
Other (Campus News, Lobo, professors, personal observations were mentioned)	Yes-34 (8.8%)	No-354 (91.2%)

The highest positive frequencies reported were for newspapers (63%), television (47%), and students (31%). These sources of information were cross-tabulated with the key demographic variables.

Newspaper

The only significant variable for this source was age: the older the sample, the more they were dependent upon the newspaper as their primary source of information about UNM. While not significant, there were some trends favoring men over women, higher income over lower income bracket, and higher social class over lower on this source of information.

Television

Place of residence, age, sex and social class were significant variables on this source of information about UNM. As might be expected, respondents in rural areas depended more upon television for their information than those in urban areas. Residents in Chavez and Eddy counties also reported little use of television (31%); this could be due to the fact that much of the coverage of that area is by Texas TV stations. Age yielded a curvi-linear relationship on the television source; those under 21 and over 50 used TV the least while those between 21 and 50, the most. Women relied more upon television than men, and the lower the social class the more the respondents used television as their prime source of information. Other variables were not significant.

Students (Radio, Channel 5, "UNM Reports", Friends, Alumni Publications and Other were too skewed for cross-tabulation.)

Only level of education completed and income were significant for this source of information. The higher the level of education and the lower the income, the more likely a respondent was to rely upon students as a prime source for information about UNM.

Question: Please number, in order of importance to you, the fields of interest at UNM about which you would like to know more.

(Ranked first) Teaching-131 (46.8%) Research-51 (18.2%)

Community Service-79 (28.2%) Other-19 (6.8%)

Most of the sample ranked teaching first as the area of UNM they would like to know more about; community service was ranked second and research last. Cross-tabulation results indicated that only age and amount of education completed were significant variables. Respondents under 21 want to know more about community service; those between 31-50 want to know more about teaching; and those respondents over 50 want to know more about UNM's research. Teaching was most important to those subjects with the most education; community service was more important to those subjects with less than a high school degree.

Question: Were you aware of events on the UNM campus May 9-13, 1972?

Yes-338 (89.9%) No-38 (10.1%)

Since almost 90% of the sample were aware of the student unrest and the associated events during the above week, cross-tabulation was not done on this question.

3. Attitudinal Questions

Question: Do you feel that UNM provides adequate service to the State with regard to

Teaching? Yes-242 (68.8%) No-110 (31.2%)

Income and level of education were the only significant variables on this question. The middle and upper income brackets ($10,000-25,000) were most negative on this question. University and high school graduates were most positive on this question; those without a high school degree or who completed graduate school were most negative on this item.

Research? Yes-204 (62.6%) No-122 (37.4%)

The only variable found to be significant on this question was place of residence. Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, San Juan counties were most negative; and Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Lincoln and Otero were most positive toward the adequacy of UNM's research service to the State.

Community Service? Yes-143 (45%) No-175 (55%)

A majority of the sample believed that UNM does not provide adequate community service to the State. None of the dependent variables were significant on this

question but some trends were indicated: respondents in Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel and Taos counties were most positive, and those in Lea and San Juan counties most negative; the higher social classes had a lower estimate of UNM's community service than the lower social classes; the highest income brackets (above $15,000) were most negative and the lowest (below $4,000) was most positive.

Question: On the whole, do you believe that UNM provides an education for its graduates which meets the needs of the State?

Yes-202 (52.4%) No-107 (27.7%) No Opinion-77 (19.9%)

A slight majority of the sample was positive toward UNM on this question. Level of education and income were significant on this question. University graduates were most positive and those from two-year or technical schools were most negative. Respondents whose incomes were between $6,000-9,000 were most negative; those between $10,000-12,000 most positive; and those below $6,000 most indecisive on this question. Those respondents connected with UNM (especially employees) were most favorable, although this was not significant. One other cross-tabulation (place of residence with social class) showed some significance: respondents from the upper social class (professionals, etc.) in Bernalillo, Sandoval and Valencia counties were most negative on this question; those from the lowest social class (laborers, etc.) in Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel and Taos counties were most positive on this question.

Question: If you have had an opportunity to evaluate the work of UNM graduates, how would you rate their capability on this scale?

10 (7.5%)	17 (12.8%)	55 (41.4%)	33 (24.8%)	18 (13.5%)
1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

No Contact- 255

Of those respondents who were in a position to evaluate UNM graduates' work ability (n=133), most rated them average (3) or above average (4). The significant variables on the cross-tabulation were: social class, connection with UNM and place of residence. The middle class (blue collar workers) rated UNM graduates highest and the upper middle class (semi-professionals) rated them lowest. Those with connection to UNM rated the graduates highest. And those

respondents in Los Alamos and Santa Fe counties in the highest social class (professionals) and without connection to UNM rate its graduates about average; those respondents in the same counties, and also without UNM connection, but in the semi-professional social class (II) rate UNM graduates below average. Those respondents in Bernalillo, Sandoval and Valencia counties in the lowest social class (laborers-V) rate UNM graduates as above average.

Question: Would you attend UNM if you had the opportunity?

Yes-157 (40.7%) No-164 (42.5%) No Opinion-64 (16.6%)

A large majority of the respondents to this question (60%) were either unwilling or unsure about attending UNM (if they had the opportunity). Several variables were significant on this question. Respondents from Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia, Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Taos, and San Juan counties were most positive on this question; respondents from Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Lincoln, Otero, Curry, Roosevelt and McKinley counties were most negative. Women were more positive about attending UNM than men. Republicans were significantly more willing to attend than Democrats or "Others." Respondents with advanced degrees were most negative (as well as high school graduates and two-year school graduates); university graduates were most positive. Middle class respondents were more willing to attend UNM than either the extreme upper or lower classes. However, income seemed to contradict this finding: those whose incomes were below $4,000 or between $6,000-8,000 were more willing to attend than those in the upper income brackets. Of course, those respondents connected with UNM were more willing to attend UNM than those not connected.

Question: Would you like your children to attend UNM?

Yes-156 (40.5%) No-166 (43.1%) No Opinion-63 (16.4%)

Once again, about 60% of the responses were either negative or unsure on this question relating to an overall attitude toward UNM. Once again, respondents from Bernalillo, Sandoval, Valencia, Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel and Taos counties were most favorable. Respondents from Chavez, Eddy and Lea counties were most negative. The younger respondents were more favorable and those respondents between 41-50 (who may have children of college age) were most negative. The lowest social class (V-laborers) was most positive; the lowest income levels were most favorable (thus supporting the social class

variable); high school graduates were most positive, and graduate school educated respondents most negative. The social class variable was especially significant with those respondents with no connection with UNM: the lower the social class, the more positive the desire to send their children to UNM. Other demographic variables were not significant.

Question: On the whole, how satisfied are you with UNM?

43 (11.5%)	118 (31.6%)	69 (18.4%)	74 (19.8%)	70 (18.7%)
very satisfied	fairly satisfied	uncertain	fairly unsatisfied	very unsatisfied

The purpose of this question was to obtain an overall reading of the voting public's satisfaction with UNM. The results on this question support those of the previous two questions (from which one may infer an overall attitude): almost 60% of the sample was uncertain, fairly or very unsatisfied with UNM. Age, education, social class, income and connection with UNM were significant variables on this question. Sex and political party affiliation were not significant, but trends approaching significance were noted.

Those respondents over 50 years old were most satisfied with UNM; those between 31-40 were most dissatisfied. University graduates were most satisfied, but those with advanced degrees were least satisfied. The lower the social class, the greater the satisfaction with UNM; this pattern was confirmed with income bracket. Those respondents with connections with UNM were more satisfied than those without connection. Women and republicans were more satisfied with UNM, but these last two variables were not significant.

Question: How has this (campus disturbance of May, 1972) affected your response to this questionnaire?

Positively-44 (11.9%) Negatively-113 (30.6%)

No Effect-212 (57.5%)

While most of the sample reported that their opinions were not altered by the demonstration against the war, most of those who admitted being affected were affected negatively. The chi square analysis on the cross-tabulations revealed significant differences on the following variables: age, education, income, connection with UNM. Political party affiliation approached significance and a trend is reported.

Respondents under 21 years old claimed to be positively affected by the campus disturbances; those over 50 were most negatively affected; those between 31-40 were least affected either way. As the level of education increased respondents were more negatively affected by the unrest. Also, most affected negatively were those respondents in the mid-income bracket of $10,000-12,000, and those without connection to UNM. Republicans were more negatively affected than Democrats, but this trend was not significant.

Question: If you are in an employer's position (with available jobs), are you interested in interviewing UNM graduates for a job with your company?

Yes-40 (10.5%) No-52 (13.6%) Not an Employer-290 (75.9%)

Since most of the respondents were not in an employer's position, the distribution was too skewed to conduct any further analysis. (A list of those respondents indicating a willingness to employ UNM graduates was distributed to the UNM Placement Center.)

Summary of Findings of Entire Survey

An examination of the informational questions reveals that UNM effectively (93%) communicates itself to the voting public as an institution of teaching; 97% of the sample agreed that UNM should be an institution of teaching. Fewer respondents (75%) understood UNM to be an institution of research, and only 56% perceived UNM as an institution of community service (78% believed that it should be an institute of community service and 90% of research). 47% of the sample declared that they would like to know more about UNM's community service, but 58% wanted to know more about UNM's teaching. Only 37% of the sample was aware of research or service benefits in their community.

Newspapers are the medium used most often by the respondents to receive information about the University. Television is the second most frequently cited channel, and "UNM Reports" the least often used. On the whole, men were more knowledgeable than women about UNM, and the younger age groups (below 30 years) seemed to be more aware of the various aspects of the University than the older respondents.

Overall attitude toward UNM is not positive among the voters sampled. 60% were unwilling to attend UNM, send their children to UNM, or were uncertain about this action.

Once again, 60% of the sample was uncertain, fairly or very dissatisfied with UNM (on the whole). Most positive aspects of UNM were its teaching; most negative responses were directed to its community service. Republicans were more positive than Democrats; lower classes and lower income levels were more positive than the higher levels and classes; high school graduates were more favorable than more educated respondents. And the most favorable responses came more often from respondents in Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Taos counties (and occasionally from those in Bernalillo, Sandoval, and Valencia counties). Most negative responses more often came from respondents in Lea, San Juan, McKinley, Chavez, and Eddy counties.

On the basis of the findings of this survey, certain recommendations are made in the next section of this report.

III. Recommendations for Improving University-Public Communication

A. The D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conferences should be continued and held at least twice a year. Fewer UNM participants and more community participants should be invited. This change plus the increase in the number of meetings should give more New Mexico decision-makers an opportunity to interact with UNM personnel.

B. Better use of the mass media should be encouraged to enhance the image of UNM. Specific suggestions include:

1. "Ferrel Heady TV Show" weekly on one of the major TV stations. Since we already have a football and basketball-coach weekly show, it should be relatively simple to adopt this program.

2. TV spots and commercials (and radio) should be used throughout the state. These should be written by media experts familiar with the best method for getting maximum impact. This technique could be especially helpful in rural parts of the state where television is heavily relied upon as a source of information.

3. Current films should be made (possibly by UNM students) for dissemination in high schools, civic clubs, etc.

4. Disseminate a weekly or bi-weekly UNM calendar for local newspaper publication (even in distant areas).

C. In the area of "personal communication," the following are recommended:

1. Key student-faculty-administrator leaders should form a "UNM Amigos" team to conduct handshake tours around the State (outside the Albuquerque area).

2. A similar concept could be developed by the alumni association and also include "friends of UNM" (such as the Lobo Club).

3. High schools should be "invaded" by faculty-student teams from every department for the joint purpose of recruiting future students and informing the high schools about current academic developments (in each department).

4. A parents' committee should be established (possibly through the Student Affairs Office or the Orientation Office) for the purpose of improving communication between UNM and the parents of its student body. A parents' newsletter should also be adopted.

D. The current LUSC should be immediately abolished and replaced by a Legislative-University Communication Committee whose sole purpose will be to conduct rap-information exchange sessions with campus representatives (in Santa Fe and on the local campuses). They will have no subpoena power and no investigatory function. They should function similarly to the Governor's faculty rap sessions.

E. The Governor should establish a students' committee to monitor feedback regularly from students to him. The mechanism for this feedback system should be jointly developed by both parties.

F. The Placement Office should attempt to improve relations between New Mexico employers and UNM graduates. A first step to reduce the exodus of UNM graduates from New Mexico will be taken in the fall, 1972 when the Governor's committee (ACCEPT) will sponsor a job conference for New Mexico employers and UNM students.

G. A "hot-line" could be established statewide whereby any New Mexico resident could telephone UNM (a special "800" number) to receive current information and news about any aspect of UNM. The UNM Report which is sent out over radio stations may be a good vehicle to begin with by taping it and putting it on the telephone. Another possibility is to allow the resident to leave a message, his name, number, etc. in order to be called back with an answer to his question. Of course, ideally, (and expensively) a "live" person should answer all calls (perhaps, after a tape is played about current UNM news). Such a "hot-line" could easily be evaluated for effectiveness by counting the number of calls/day and content analyzing their purpose, etc.

H. The Governor's meetings with UNM faculty should be continued and possibly expanded to include representatives of the other state universities.

I. The above mentioned ISRAD recommendations (see section on ISRAD) should be implemented plus a possible ISRAD television or radio show and/or an "ask-ISRAD" column in the newspaper.

J. The UNM Public Opinion Poll should be conducted annually to monitor feedback, measure attitudes, and compile comparative data to assess the impact of any long-term changes at UNM. The results of the first survey lead to the following specific recommendations which may reinforce and/or add to some of those already made above:

1. If it is the desire of UNM to project an image of being a community service institution in addition to teaching and research, more concentrated efforts will have to be made in this area. The public media will probably have to be relied upon because 76% of the sample showed no direct contact with UNM. Areas which are most lacking in understanding this concept (Catron, Grant, Sierra, Socorro, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, and McKinley counties) could probably be best informed (according to this survey) by television (spots, ISRAD show, etc.). Newspaper coverage will probably be most effective with the older age groups who show misunderstanding of this UNM function.

2. In a similar manner the University must emphasize its achievements and benefits to local communities in the area of research and community service. Special attention should be given to Curry, Roosevelt, Lea and San Juan counties. To a slightly greater extent, information and programs of interest to males might be stressed (since females are more favorable toward UNM already).

3. Efforts to show the value of UNM's educational contributions to the state should be concentrated in McKinley and San Juan counties. Since those with two-year and graduate (advanced degree) education were most negative, causal factors should be uncovered and these audiences reached.

4. Whatever campaign is developed by UNM, it should probably incorporate appeals to higher income levels, better educated citizens between the ages of 31-50 who live in Colfax, Union, Lincoln, Otero, Curry, Roosevelt, Lea, McKinley, San Juan, Socorro, Sierra, Grant and Catron counties (where overall dissatisfaction is greatest).

K. In the final analysis, whatever sophisticated media-oriented (or personally-oriented) communication campaign is developed, it should be recognized that every student, faculty member, administrator, janitor, secretary, staff member, etc. connected with UNM is actually a separate channel of communication. If we can learn to use our own human resources to better enhance our external image, we may be in little need of accomplishing that purpose.

Bibliography

Bittner, John, et.al. "College Administrators Reactions to News Coverage of Campus Unrest," Unpublished Manuscript delivered at the International Communication Association Convention, April 24, 1971, Phoenix, Arizona, p. 1-4.

Cargo, David, Interview with this researcher, October 30, 1970, Santa Fe.

Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VI, No. 30, May 1, 1972, p. 1.

For Your Information. Washington, D. C.: Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, September 18, 1970, pp. 1-2.

Lewis, James J. "Reactions of the General Public to Obscenity at College Demonstrations," Unpublished Manuscript delivered at the International Communication Association Convention, April 24, 1971, Phoenix, Arizona, p. 20.

Linowitz, Sol M. Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Washington, D. C. : American Council of Education, 1970, p. 5.

Price, Jess, "D. H. Lawrence Ranch Conference: Retreat Into Reality," Unpublished Manuscript delivered at the National Conference of the American College Public Relations Association, June 23, 1969, New York City, pp. 1-10.

Scranton, William. "Text of the Findings of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. V, No. 2, October 5, 1970, p. 2.

Smith, M. Brewster, "The Future of Campus Unrest," Unpublished Manuscript delivered at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, November 22, 1971, Fresno, California.

UNM Lobo, November 5, 1971, p. 1.